JEWS' COLLEGE PUBLICATIONS, No. 10

THE OLD RABBINIC DOCTRINE OF GOD

I. THE NAMES & ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

BY

A. MARMORSTEIN, PH.D., RABBI

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON HUMPHREY MILFORD
1927

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen
New York Toronto Melbourne Capetown
Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai
HUMPHREY MILFORD
Publisher to the University

Printed in Great Britain

EX61
M35
(1)

173253

PREFACE

THE treatment of our subject requires no special apology or recommendation. There is as yet no comprehensive work dealing with our subject, which is somewhat surprising, considering its importance. The great masters of Jewish studies paved the path for grouping the works and classifying the teachers of the Haggadic literature. They left many branches of these studies untouched. Among these the theological conceptions and teachings have rightly the first claim. The first chapter of the Old-Rabbinic theology has to be devoted to the doctrine of God. The teachings of the Rabbis about God are like a mirror of the Jewish soul: without them the Jew, his history and glory, his suffering and joy, cannot be understood. These teachers exercised a greater influence on the world than some writers and scholars think, or would fain make others believe. We hope that this contribution to Rabbinic theology will help to prove the vitality of the old, dead teachers of Judaism. We regret that the work has to be printed in two parts. That this part, dealing with the names and attributes of God, can appear is due to Mr. S. Japhet, the esteemed Chairman of the Council of the Jews' College, whose kindness is hereby gratefully acknowledged. We have also to thank my friend, the Rev. R. F[illegible]ch-Hoyle, A.T.S., Baptist minister, Belvedere (Kent), for his valuable assistance given me in reading the manuscript and proofs of my work.

A. MARMORSTEIN.

LONDON, 21*st April*, 1927.

CONTENTS

	PAGES
INTRODUCTION	7–16
A. THE NAMES OF GOD	17–145
I. The Pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton	17–40
II. The Names of God in the Bible . .	41–53
III. The Rabbinic Synonyms for God . .	54–107
IV. The Sources	108–147
B. THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD . . .	148–217
(1) Omnipresence	148–153
(2) Omniscience	153–160
(3) Omnipotence	160–176
(4) The Eternity of God	176–179
(5) Truth	179–181
(6) Justice	181–196
(7) Goodness	196–208
(8) Purity and Holiness	208–217

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Aboth dRN, or AdRN	= Aboth di R. Nathan, ed. Schechter.
Ag. Ber.	= Agadath Bereshith, ed. Buber (= B).
A. Z.	= Aboda Zara.
B	= Buber.
B or Bab.	= Babylonian Talmud.
B. B.	= Baba Bathra.
B. K.	= Baba Kamma.
B. M.	= Baba Mezia.
Ber.	= Berakhoth.
Cant. r.	= Canticles rabba.
Deut. r.	= Deuteronomy rabba.
Eccl. r.	= Ecclesiastes rabba.
Exod. r.	= Exodus rabba.
Gen. r.	= Genesis rabba, ed. Theodor.
H. B.	= Hebräische Bibliographie.
J.	= Jerushalmi, v. also Pal.
Lam. r.	= Lamentations rabba.
Lev. r.	= Leviticus rabba.
M.	= Mishnah.
M. Sam.	= Midrash Samuel, ed. Buber.
M. Ps.	= Midrash Psalms, ed. Buber.
M. Tadshe	= Midrash Tadshe, ed. Epstein.
M. Tan.	= Midrash Tannaim, ed. Hoffmann.
Mekh.	= Mekhilta, ed. Friedmann.
MGWJ	= Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des [Judentums.
M.R.S.b.J.	= Mekhilta R. Simon ben Johai, ed. Hoffmann.
Num. r.	= Numbers r.
Pal.	= Palestinian Talmud.
Pes. B.	= Pesikta, ed. Buber.
Pes. r.	= Pesikta rabbati, ed. Friedmann.
Pirke R. E.	= Pirke di R. Eliezer.
B. Jon.	= Bends Jonathan Targum on the Pentateuch.
R. H.	= Rosh Ha Shanah.
R. É. J.	= Revue des Études Juives.
Ruth r.	= Ruth rabba.
S.E.R. or S.E.Z.	= Seder Elijahu rabba or zutta, ed. Friedmann.
Sifre	= ed. Friedmann.
T. K. or Tor. Koh.	= Torath Kohanim, ed. Warsaw.
Tanhuma	= ed. Buber, or F. ed. Frankfurt a. O.
Th.	= Theodor.
Tos.	= Tosefta, ed. Zuckermandel.
ZAW	= Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZfNW	= Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.

INTRODUCTION

'If thou desirest to recognize Him who spake and the world was created, learn Haggada, for through it thou wilt recognize God, and cleave unto His ways.' These words are quoted in the name of the old interpreters of signs called, דורשי רשומות.[1] The old allegorists distinctly point out the twofold aim of the Haggada: *the recognition of God*, and *the following in God's ways*, or the *imitatio Dei*. Accordingly Haggada teaches the existence and unity, the essence and attributes, the providence and love of God. It is true that the very same Haggada knows of persons who, of themselves, recognized and arrived at the knowledge of God the Creator, without teachers and books, preachers and study.[2] The Haggada is still the best teacher to make the human Divine and the Divine human. Modern thought concerning the philosophy of religion draws nearer to this conception of the real function of belief and religion. It seems, therefore, worth while to consult these anticipators of present-day

[1] Sifre Deut., § 49, p. 85 A, דורשי רשומות אומרים רצונך שתכיר מי שאמר והיה העולם למוד הגדה שמתוך כך אתה מכיר את הקב"ה ומדבק בדרכיו. v. M. Tannaim, 44, שמתוך כך אתה מכיר את מי שאמר והיה העולם ומדבק בדרכיו, and Sifre, p, 74 A. v. on the allegorists, I. Levy, *RÉJ.*, lx, pp. 24–31, Jacob Lauterbach, *JQR.*, N. S., i, pp. 291–333, 503–531 and D. Neumark, *Maybaum Festschrift*, Berlin., 1914, pp. 179 ff. Philo considers the *recognitio dei* the ultimate aim of human life. Other passages pointing out this function of the Haggada will be dealt with in the course of this essay. Here we may refer to Midrash Psalms, ed. Buber, 230; R. Joshua ben Levi says: בי לא יבינו אל פעלת ה' ואל מעשה ידיו יהרסם ולא יבנם אלו האגדות. The neglect of haggadic studies leads to the disregard of the works of God and to the destruction of the operation of His hands, Ps. 28. 6 (v. מנורת המאור, ed. Krotoschin, i, p. 19, Finn, האסיף, 1884, p. 94; as to R. Joshua ben Levi's attitude towards the Haggada, v. Bacher, *Ag. Pal. Amoräer*, i. 128). The popularity of the Haggada is often emphasized, v. Mekh. 46 A, 51 A, Yoma 75 A, Midr. Cant ed. Grünhut, p. 46 B.

[2] For instance, Abraham, Job, Hezekiah, and the Messiah, see Num. r. 14, 2, וזהו אחד מד' בני אדם שמעצמם הבירו להקב"ה איוב חזקיה ומלך המשיח, as to Abraham, v. also Gen. r. 38. 8; 39. 1; 61. 1; 64. 4; b. Ned. 32 a; Aboth R. N. ch. 33, M. Ps. 1. 13.

tendencies on the subject of religion generally. The phrase '*Gotttrunkenheit*', rightly used or not of Spinoza, is applicable to many of the Scribes. In the first four centuries Palestine and Babylon produced many examples of that type of men and women who were inebriated with the glory and majesty of God. Their whole lives, from the cradle to the grave, were devoted and dedicated to God. To our thinking it is desirable to analyse and expound these teachings in a work dealing with the Old-Rabbinic doctrine of God.

Many attempts, scholarly and otherwise, serious and superficial, unbiased and partial, have been made in the last thirty or forty years to describe or distort the religion of the Jews in the first century of the current era. One is rightly surprised at the meagre result and the lack of success achieved by the long rows of books which fill the libraries. The causes of this great failure may be explained in various ways. It is due primarily to want of thorough Rabbinic knowledge, and in the second place to making use of that imperfect knowledge with utterly wrong methods of application. Is it not amazing that we possess no complete work describing and analysing, estimating or criticizing the sayings and teachings of the Jewish teachers concerning the doctrine of God? No proper valuation of the religious life of an age or a community can be attempted by scholars without seeing and examining the teachings about God on such themes as His essence and existence, His relation to the world and man, His providence, His universality and particular relation to Israel, His creation and omnipresence, His Fatherhood and Rulership, His omnipotence and omniscience, His justice and love. It is no mean task to collect and explain all the sayings gathered from the Rabbinic sources on these subjects, generally and individually. There is scarcely a page in the many hundred folios of Old Rabbinic literature without at least some lines expressing one or more doctrines, or containing references concerning God. Some of them appear to be uncouth,

others sublime; some are deposits from primitive ways of thinking, some strike us as the climax of theological or philosophical teachings. All Rabbinic teachings on the most manifold aspects and subjects of this doctrine will be treated in the following pages. There are different ways of placing these doctrines before students and scholars. We follow the historical method. We treat the themes arising out of our material in chronological order. Neither apologetical nor polemical motives influence our aims. A good deal of true religious thought, advanced and proclaimed by those unassuming and quiet teachers of Judaea and Galilee, became the common treasure of all civilized religions. Every religion worth its name needs at least some of them. Yet very often contemporary philosophy and theology help us to find the real meaning of Rabbinic teachings. Pagan, Gnostic, as well as Christian influence can be traced in many words and sayings of our literature. History, with its good and bad effects, accompanies Haggadic lore. The visible world throws its deep shadows upon the invisible, and the latter inspires the former with awe. Ages of peace and prosperity present different problems of thought from those of war and suffering, and these modify ancient beliefs. The advance and decline of culture and civilization equally contribute their share to shaking old-established dogmas and result in formulating and altering ancient opinions concerning the Supreme Being, and His relation to the children of men and the world. How far our present-day belief and doctrine is behind or ahead of the old Rabbinic doctrine of God is not the present writer's wish or task to discuss. Having weighed the words of hundreds of teachers of the first four centuries, having examined their advanced position in theology and their references to the doctrine of God in the Bible, having listened at the fount of the ever fresh waters to the life-giving force of their words, one is justly entitled to pronounce the verdict of history that without this contribution no religious enlightenment is to be thought

of. Thanks to these treasures of religious thoughts, theological speculations, and ever deepening piety, the ordinary Jew is equipped with a philosophy of religion which is not inferior to any other, however advanced and impressive. Neither Zoroaster nor Buddha, neither Jesus nor Paul, neither Origen nor Augustine can teach religion, can reveal God in a worthier way than that paved by these Scribes. We may point to Plato for parallels, we may cite the Stoics for some parables, we may refer to Cynics or Epicureans for criticism of heathendom and idolatry, yet they do not diminish the individuality of Rabbinic thought. The teachers of Judaism may have adopted foreign ideas, they may have assimilated pagan philosophical thoughts, they may have even adapted Babylonian or Egyptian, Greek or Barbarian myths and legends, but the teaching derived from them sounds quite new and original. For one thing is perfectly certain, there is no class of men in the world to whom the idea of God was so near, whose longing for God so ardent, whose zeal to do God's will so keen, whose ideal of piety, love, goodness, justice, purity, and holiness so supreme in all their actions and thoughts, deeds and meditations, as in the much-despised and unjustly judged Scribes. The majority of them are and will remain the living instances of religion in its most accomplished and perfect embodiment. There were, are, and will be times when the hearts of people will burn with desire to seek and see God. Likewise there are movements and periods when the masses turn shamefacedly away from their Father in Heaven. Both have deeper causes and are not without inner connexion with the doings of men and happenings of the world. Teachers of religion have the enviable and arduous task to stand firm in both cases, by spreading and preaching, affirming and enriching, deepening and amplifying the doctrine of God. We are not partial and biased in attributing the chief place in performing this duty on the part of the teachers of religion to the leading and moving spirits of the Jewish people—the immortal Tannaim and Amoraim!

Their contributions to the development of the teachings concerning God and religion, ethics, and piety cannot be overrated, though they very often have been underrated. What does that matter? The law, the prophets, Jews and Judaism have shared the same fate. Worldly success, earthly honour is a very poor arbiter!

This work endeavours to present the doctrine of God according to the sources of information as preserved in the ancient writings of the Rabbinic teachers and sages, homilists and thinkers. How far they touch our present religious needs and troubles can be read between the lines of their writings. On the whole one cannot but exclaim, 'How little mental conditions have changed in these last eighteen hundred years or so!' The Rabbis had to face almost the same problems and answer the same questions as arise nowadays. How far their answers and points of view hold good to-day is another question altogether. The same is the case with some of their own doctrines which on their part gave rise to new problems and difficulties. Thanks to the studies and works of the great masters of the last century, and to the scholarly editions of old, lost and rediscovered, gems of Midrashic lore, we are now able to arrange and classify with some method the sources according to the times and countries of their origin. Yet there are still many difficulties to be tackled. There are, first of all, the many hundred folios of this vast literature which have to be searched anew. Their lines are full of teachings, sublime and primitive, about God. The numerous teachers, Halakhists and Haggadists, known and unknown, missed no opportunity of airing and emphasizing their views about God. The Divinity was felt by them, was present in their homes and schools, glorified their life, sanctified their work—no space or moment of existence, in the seen and unseen world, in the shadow of life and beyond the grave could be imagined without Him. Consequently, there is no aspect of primitive or advanced religious thought which has ever agitated the

mind of man and has a bearing on Divinity and Godhead to which those sages remained indifferent, and to which they did not contribute their proper share in elucidating or developing them.

The vastness of our material is not the only trouble. Writers generally speak of Rabbinic belief, Rabbinic doctrines, as if they were held generally, paying not the slightest attention to the places and times of their origin. They do not see the differences between theological conceptions of the Tannaitic teachers and those of the Amoraic period, between South and North, between Palestine and Babylon, Alexandria and Jerusalem. Each saying must be judged in relation to the time and country of its teacher. We have to weigh and measure with the just *ephah* of the past and just *hin* of the future. The local and temporal conditions of the teachers, their cultural and religious standard, must never be lost sight of. Otherwise, one cannot arrive at a just estimate. These considerations account also for some striking facts we shall meet with in the course of our discussion, viz. treating one subject or side issue in one generation and neglecting it at other times. Life with its new and old problems and riddles cannot be divorced from the philosophy or theology of the surrounding world. Therefore, these external sources of knowledge have to be considered in the same way as human feelings and longings for the unseen or supernatural, in dealing with the highest and sublimest questions regarding God.

There are different ways of placing the wealth of Rabbinical material on this subject before the reader. The sages of the Middle Ages, from Sa'adya to Maimonides, who developed a philosophy of religion, are the best examples of the influence of their age on their theology. Whilst Sa'adya begins his work with the problems of the existence and unity of God, the great teacher of Cordova starts with the anthropomorphic conceptions in the Scriptures. Both methods can be easily justified. We limit our subject to the Rabbinic material and use the historical method. We

have to begin with the *Names of God*, dealing first with the use of the old biblical names as far as they are still used in our period and understood by the spokesmen of our time. Names were in antiquity of greater importance than they are at present. To the primitive mind a name is a mystery, powerful and of the greatest importance for the well-being or ill-luck of a person. The sacredness and awe of a name is the subject of many investigations, which reveal a strange contrast between the feelings of the present on one side and that of more remote centuries on the other side. That being the case with the name of an ordinary person, how much more with the Name of God, the Name κατ' ἐξοχήν! The origin, development, popularity, and abandonment of a divine name contain the history of more than one religious movement. It is a step in the evolution of religious thought and intellectual development. How did these Names originate? Were they born under foreign influences, or did the religious genius of the people invent them? Are they revealed by the Deity to the chosen ones? Why are they, after a time, discarded altogether, supplanted by others, or relegated into dark corners of magic or prayers? The history of the Divine Names in our literature offers a good many observations on and explanations of these questions. Some points are shrouded in obscurity, others may become clearer by investigation. We notice a very far-reaching difference between Palestinian and Alexandrian theology concerning the Tetragrammaton. A bitter struggle between Hellenists and Hasidim centred around the pronunciation of the Divine Name. A similar controversy arose afterwards around the use of the name Elohim and even as to the substitution of the Tetragrammaton. This led us to investigate the various Names applied by the Scribes to God. Here a wealthy sanctuary of the most treasured religious ideas and doctrines is opened to us, which invites entrance to all who want to come nearer to God. Nowhere is the creative genius of the pious scribes more at its best than in

this long list. Some of them occur in great variety. They teach us further, especially when reviewing our literary documents, that the Biblical names gave way to names designating God as the High, Heaven, &c. They were discarded in their turn by the term המקום (the omnipresent) till this Name became so holy that it was replaced by הקב"ה, 'the Holy One blessed be He'. We see here a development from the concrete to the abstract. Fortunately we are enabled to fix the dates of these changes. The names 'Heaven', or 'High', 'Highest' were in vogue till the Hasmonean period, המקום till the beginning of the third century C. E., when the great change, owing to external influences and internal movements, was made necessary. This is noticed in other domains of the Haggada generally and of our doctrine especially. Later on even this Name was altered to השם, or writers reverted to the oldest Name, *Elohim*. This history of the Divine Name or Names in our literary documents reveals many new aspects of Rabbinic theology. We are now enabled to fix the ages of older anonymous sayings interspersed in later Midrashic works, likewise to single out more recent material in the old Tannaitic sources. Our texts are unfortunately in such a condition that not much reliance can be placed on them. The burden of our proof had to be put on such works which are at our disposal either in critical editions or on the Talmudic text which support our contention in an unexpected manner.

The Names lead us to the second part of our doctrine, to the Attributes of God. The attributes of the divine being are in all advanced religions the points which differentiate between one religious form and the other, between monotheistic religions and polytheistic forms of worship. There is no contest of opinions on the generally recognized fact that the religion of the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Psalmists, in spite of all the crudities and blame attached to it by biased and short-sighted critics, reached a height which entitles it to head all the higher religious systems of antiquity. This would be even more generally recognized when

speaking of the religion of the Rabbis. There, as in many other walks of life, the old truth of 'the wisdom of the poor', which is despised, finds its corroboration. Were it not Israel's heritage, the Jews' glory, the Rabbis' teaching, but some Mexican deity or Tibetan wise man, well, the adoration of the whole civilized world would be assured to it. But, it is the religion of the Jews!—moreover of the Rabbis, the Scribes, the Pharisees! That is enough to make it ignored or misjudged. These Attributes show the climax of the purest conception of the deity. God's Omnipresence, Omniscience, Omnipotence, Eternity, Truth, Justice, Benevolence, Purity, and Holiness are so many landmarks on the road leading to God. Some of them are to be met with in cruder forms of religious systems. Yet most of them are specially to be pointed out. The gods, even the highest of them, cannot be imagined as everywhere present or all-powerful. Even Zeus is the victim of some tricks which he cannot control or help. Then there is the ugly feature of the dying or reviving gods. We are firmly convinced that the teachings of the Scribes of the purity and holiness of God, if properly understood, will help all God-seeking people in their longing for a religious form of worship freed from all shackles of polytheism which still bind their religious outlook. The Attributes are of the utmost influence on human society and institutions. Our ideal life, life as it ought to be, and not as it is, is modelled upon attributes we ascribe to God. The fuller discussion of this point is part of the subject of the third chapter, dealing with the anthropomorphism and imitation of God.

Owing to technical reasons this work had to be divided into two parts. The second part will deal with the problem of anthropomorphism and anthropopathism, the relation of God to man and God to the world, the unity of God, and the existence of God. Some of the problems and attributes are so complex that the whole material can be judged only in connexion with the second part. The conclusion will give a survey of the contributions of the Scribes from

Simon the Just to the last of the Haggadists of the Amoraic period, to the doctrine of God. Whilst history aims at the description and study of the life and development of man, theology's subject is God. Historical theology has for its task to show the place of religion and its influence on society on one side, and man's drawing nearer to and developing clearer *the* most important problem of the mind—God—on the other. Our time is looking for God, searching after the Divine, longing for the unseen, hoping for redemption, dissatisfied with the past, and anxious for the future. May this modest contribution, based on the experience of seekers of God, help others to find Him, see Him, and imitate Him. God was through the ages, and remains up to this day, the beginning and end of Jewish thought, Jewish teaching, Jewish philosophy, Jewish poetry, Jewish mysticism, Jewish scholarship, and last but not least, Jewish life. The first step to recognize Him is to investigate the history of the Divine Names in Old-Rabbinic Theology.

A.

THE NAMES OF GOD

I.

The Pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton.

Greek philosophy, Jewish Alexandrinian theology, Christian apology and Gnostic lore concur in the idea of God's *namelessness*.[1] That God has no name, was taught by Aristotle,[2] Seneca,[3] Maxim of Tyre,[4] Celsus,[5] and Hermes Trismegistus.[6] The Seventy altered in several places the Hebrew text of the Scriptures in order to reconcile the philosophy of their adopted country with the doctrines of their ancestral faith.[7] Philo follows the footsteps of the Seventy.[8] Christian apologists emphasize this teaching again and again.[9] Apparently, Christians and Jews, who wrote for heathens, could not divert their attention from a teaching which was current in their days and countries. What was the attitude of the Palestinian teachers towards this apparently accepted philosophic dogma of their age?

The influence of Greek philosophy is felt in the LXX.

[1] Geffcken, J., *Zwei Griechische Apologeten*, Leipzig, 1907, p. 38.

[2] Περὶ Κόσμου, 7, Dio, *Or.* xii. 75.

[3] *Nat. qu.* 2. 45. [4] 8. 10. [5] Origen, i. 24.

[6] 5. 1. 10; v also Hennecke, *Judenchristentum*, p. 53

[7] v. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd-alex. Religions-Philosophie*, Halle, 1834, ii. 27–32, v. also Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 191, Or. Ltbl., 1849, 18.

[8] v. Dähne, loc. cit. i. 139 ff., 148 ff.; Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, Leipzig, 1909, iv.[4] 403.

[9] Aristides, Justin, *Apol.* ii. 6, 3; Tatian, 4; Clem. Strom. v. 12. 8, 3; Ps. Melito, 2; Cohort, 21; Min. Felix, 18. 10, Geffcken, loc. cit., p. 39.

They see in Lev. 24. 15 f. a prohibition of pronouncing the divine name (*ὀνομάζων δε τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θανάτῳ θανατούσθω*). Philo, Josephus, and Aquila (et denominans nomen dei morte morietur) agree with their Greek Bible. Moses forbade, according to Philo,[10] to curse the name of false gods, in order that his pupils should not get used to treating lightly the name of God, because these designations require the highest respect and the deepest reverence. If, however, one dares to mention His name at an ordinary time he is guilty of death, not to speak of blaspheming the name of the Lord of all creatures and gods. Philo repeats himself very often, especially on subjects dear to him. He held with his teachers of philosophy that no name can adequately give an idea or expression of God.[11] New material is gained from the Magic Tablet of Adrumetum, where the important saying is inserted: *ὁρκίζω σε τὸ ἅγιον ὄνομα ὃ οὐ λέγεται* (lines 19, 20). 'I adjure thee by the sacred name which is not uttered in any place.' This is the old reading of Maspero: *ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ*, 'not even in the Temple'. Deissmann[12] considers it 'absolutely impossible that any one having any kind of sympathy with Judaism whatever could assert that the Holy Name was not pronounced in the Temple'. There is no doubt that the date of this exorcism was very old, and reflects the conditions on which the LXX is based. Yet there was a time when this prohibition was entirely unknown among the Jews in Egypt as well as in Babylon, not to mention Palestine. The Elephantine papyri taught many new things, dispelled many recent mistakes, and verified many old traditions. The writer of the Aristeas letter did not exaggerate in reporting that there were Jewish colonies in Egypt long before Alexander the Great. These Jews had a sanctuary dedicated to their God יהו. Many of the names found in that highly interesting collection

[10] *De vita Mos.* ii. 683.

[11] *De Somn.* i. 375; *De vita Mos.* i. 614, *De nom. mutat.* 1045 f.

[12] *Biblical Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 287.

begin or end with יהו or יה[13]. In the Babylonian documents of Nippur, dating from the time of Artaxerxes I up to Darius Hystaspis we find many names ending with יה, and Jama, which is equal with Jawa, יהו.[14] Neither in Egypt, nor in Babylonia, did the Jews know or keep a law prohibiting the use of God's name, the Tetragrammaton, in ordinary conversation or greetings. Yet, from the third century B.C.E. till the third century A.C.E. such a prohibition existed and was partly observed. R. Levi, a teacher of the third century, adopted literally this view in saying: 'He who pronounces God's name is guilty of death.'[15] This Haggadist, R. Levi, who was not immune from foreign influences, must have known the LXX. The Aramaic version of Ps. Jonathan adds ברם מאן דמפרש שמא יקטול ומחרף, 'He who pronounces the Name with *blasphemy* is guilty of death'. Onkelos agrees with R. Levi. According to the Mishna[16] only the blasphemer is guilty of death. The view must have been foreign to the teachers of the Mishna that the Name of God must not be pronounced. Yet there was a time when the Hellenistic rule was well-known and observed in Palestine.

We are told that the priests, after the death of Simon the Just, either ceased altogether, or stopped for a short period,[17] to use 'the Name' in pronouncing the blessing. The Tosefta reads: ומת נמנעו חביריו מלברך בשם.[18] MS. W

[13] Cf. גמריה, ידניה, מחסיה, מלכיה, v. also יהוטל, יהו שמע, יהוחן, אביהו, יהוישמע, v. Ungnad-Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus aus Elephantine*, Leipzig, 1911, p. iii f. v. however, A. Cowley, *JRAS.*, 1920, 170, *Aramaic Papyri*, Oxf., 1923, p. xviii.

[14] Cf. Gedaljawa, *Son of Sabbatai*, גדליהו בר שבתאי, v. Ungnad, loc. cit., p. iv, note; cf. also S. Daiches, *The Jews in Babylonia in the time of Ezra and Nehemia according to Babylonian Inscriptions*, London, Jews' Coll. Publ., No. 2, 1910.

[15] Pesikta R. K., ed. Buber, 148 A, כל מי שהוא מפרש שמו של הקב"ה חייב מיתה, derived from נוקב שם ק', Lev. 24. 16.

[16] Sanh. 55 B, f.

[17] v. L. Blau, *Das Altjüd. Zauberwesen*, Budapest, 1898, p. 115, K. Kohler, 'The Tetragrammaton and its uses' in *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy*, i, pp. 19-32.

[18] ed. Zuckermandel, 329. 24.

and edd. read משמת שמעון הצדיק פסקו מלברך בשם. In the Babylonian Talmud[19] the reading agrees with the Tosefta, yet instead of חבירין we read אחיו הכהנים. The Boraita is also quoted in the Pal. Talmud, yet the last sentence is omitted. *Geiger*[20] connects this historical tradition with the information derived from Hellenistic sources, according to which the pronunciation of the divine name was strictly prohibited. *Weiss*[21] says: 'We do not know the special reason for this reform, but it is quite clear that the priests, seeing the decline of faith and fear of God, considered neither themselves nor their contemporaries worthy of proclaiming or of hearing the name of God'. This information contradicts many other traditions of the Mishna. We read in the Mishna Sotah:[22] במקדש אומר את השם ככתבו ובגבולין בכינוי. In the Sanctuary the priests said the Tetragrammaton according to its writing, outside the Temple by its substitute.[22a] In Sifre[23] the subject is discussed by two scholars belonging to the school of R. Ishmael, e.g. R. Josiah and R. Jonathan. They agree with the rule codified in the Mishna: 'Thus shall ye bless the children of Israel' (Num. 6. 23) with the Name (בשם המפורש). There must have been previously a law which objected to this custom. Therefore the first-named Tannaite derives it from the word שמי, 'my name', i.e. the שם המפורש. The second teacher is inclined to base this law on Exod. 20. 24, expounding: 'Wherever *I reveal myself unto thee*, thou shalt pronounce My Name', i. e. in the Sanctuary. There is a consensus of

[19] b. Yoma 49 B. [20] *Urschrift*, 263, and Ozar Nehmad, iii. 117.

[21] דור דור ודרשיו i. 82–83.

[22] 38 b, v. Graetz, *MGWJ.* vi. 1857, p. 56, note, who thought that the prohibition of pronouncing the Tetragrammaton after the death of Simon was limited to the synagogues outside the Temple (בגבולין). Graetz based his theory on Tos. Sotah, ch. 13. The text משמת, however, does not indicate or allow any difference between מקדש and גבולין. Besides the MS. of the Midrash ha-Gadol preserved the reading מלברך בשם המפורש במקדש, v. Königsberger, in Rahmer's *Jüd. Literaturblatt*, 1900, p. 85.

[22a] Mekh. 73 B, a law is quoted: מכאן אמרו שם המפורש אסור להאמר בגבולין, derived from Exod. 20. 24, v. also M. R. S. b. J., p. 115.

[23] Num., § 39.

opinion as to the prohibition of using the Shem hamphorash outside the Temple, yet in the service of the Temple the Name was pronounced. The fuller version of this controversy is preserved in Num. r. 11. 10, which we put here together with the text of the Sifre:

Num. R.

כה תברכו בשם המפורש, אתה אומר בשם המפירש או אינו אלא בכינוי, ת"ל ושמו את שמי על בני ישראל ואני אברכם בשם המיוחד לי יכול אף בגבולין נאמר כאן ושמו את שמי ונאמר להלן לשום את שמו מה להלן בשם המפורש מכאן אמרו במקדש בשם המפורש ובמדינה בכינוי דברי ר' יאשיה.

S.

כה תברכו את בני ישראל בשם המפורש, אתה אומר בשם המפורש או אינו אלא בכינוי ת"ל ושמו את שמי על בני ישראל בשם המפורש ובגבולין בכינוי דברי ר' יאשיה.

A third version is given in B. Sotah, 38 A, where the view of R. Josiah is ascribed to R. Jonathan, and that of R. Jonathan to R. Josiah. Anyhow, we learn that according to these Rabbis the Name was pronounced in the Temple by the priests. This openly contradicts the first report. One must not assume, however, that the Scribes of the second century discussed a theoretic question or an archaeological point which had no practical value. We can cite R. Tarphon, who tells us as an eyewitness that the priests used to pronounce the Name in the Temple. R. Tarphon was of priestly descent, saw the Temple service, and relates: 'Once I followed my uncle to say the priestly blessing, and I inclined my ear near the High Priest, and I have heard that he mixed (מבליע, lit. caused to be swallowed) the Name with the tune of his brethren, the priests.'[24] The Name was said, but not distinctly. We must assume that after Simon the Just the name of God was not pronounced. Later on, when the opposition to the rule of the priests grew stronger, a compromise was

[24] B. Kid. 71 A.; v. also Pal. Yoma iii. 7, and Cant. r. 3. 11.

affected; the name of God should be pronounced in the priestly blessing, but בהבלעה, and not distinctly. In the service of the Day of Atonement, which is described in the ancient treatise of the Mishna called Joma, the confession of the High Priest is introduced by אנא השם (iii. 8, iv. 2, vi. 2) and אנא בשם (vi. 2). This is understood by most of our commentators as referring to the Name. The High Priest pronounced the Name according to its writing. The term השם obviates the idea that the High Priest had merely used a, or the substitute for the, divine name, which, of course, upsets the report about the usage after the death of Simon. There is a further passage which exhibits the same difficulty. M. Berakhoth, ix. 5, contains several institutions which are of the greatest importance for the knowledge of the intellectual movements of the first century. They instituted that people should greet their fellow men בשם 'by the Name'. The date of this arrangement must be very old. In the very Mishna it is put together with practices in the Temple. It must date back, therefore, before the destruction of the Second Temple. R. Joshua b. Levi enumerates it among the rules instituted by the Rabbis, which were sanctioned by Heaven. It ranges together with the arrangements for the reading of the Scroll of Esther on Purim, and with the discharging of the duties of the tithes during the time of the Second Temple. The passage occurs many times in the ancient Rabbinic writings. R. Simon relates in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi that three things were decreed by the earthly authorities and God agreed with them: the tithes, greeting by the name of God, and the reading of the Scroll of Esther.[25] The importance attached to the innovation is rather surprising. The date of this arrangement must coincide with that of

[25] v. Pal. Ber. 14 c; Ruth r. 4. 7; b. Meg. 7 a; b. Maccoth 23; M. Psalms, ed. Buber, p. 296; Tanhuma Buber, i. 109; Midrash Haseroth, ed. Marmorstein, p. 40, note 167, v. also Marmorstein, מאמר על איזה תנועות רוחניות בדורו של ר' יהושע בן לוי in Mélanges offerts à M. Israel Lévy, Paris, 1926, pp. i–xvi.

the other two reforms. The weight of the proofs cited for the support or the antiquity of the rule enhances its meaning. The subject is of so much importance for the questions here dealt with that the texts must be examined. The Pal. Talmud calls the author of our statement R. Joshua of the South (דרומא), i.e. *Ben Levi*, Pal., has ג׳ דברים גזרו ב״ד של מטן והסכים ב״ד של מעלה עמהן. The three decrees are: (*a*) חרמה של יריחו, (*b*) מגילת אסתר, and (*c*) שאילת שלום בשם. R. Abun adds in the name of R. J.b.L. (*d*) מעשרות. Ruth r. mentions as author R. Tanhuma in the name of the Rabbanan. The order of the decrees is *c*, *b*, and *d*. It is noteworthy that here the verse Jer. 23. 27 is first cited (who thought to make my people forget *my Name*), upon which the references to Boaz and Gideon are given. The Rabbis of the third century see in the saying of Jeremiah a reference to Athaliah, Mordecai, and Esther, or the three young men respectively. The chronological difficulties and impossibilities do not worry the teachers of the Haggada. In Midr. Psalms the saying is by R. Simon in the name of R. J. b. L. The order is *d*, *c*, and *b*. *a* is given in the name of Rabbanan. Tanh. reports the saying by R. J. b. L. in the order of *d*, *b*, and *a*; here *c* is omitted altogether. The Bab. Talmud cites the sentence in the name of R. J. b. L., the order being *b*, *c*, *d*. We have now to consider the approximate dates of these innovations.

First of all, the arrangements about the tithes. All reports agree that the duty of the tithes ceased to operate with the destruction of the first Temple, and after the exile of the Israelites into a strange land. Yet the Israelites voluntarily reserved the privilege of paying these duties. The rearrangement of the tithes by Ezra, who bestowed them on the priests that returned with him to the ancient homestead, and punished the Levites who preferred Babylon to the land of their ancestors, was often discussed and pointed out, especially by Herzfeld and Graetz.[26] We may

[26] v. the former's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i. 138, and the latter in *MGWJ.*, 1886, p. 100 ff.

take for granted that we have before us a very ancient arrangement, dating probably from the time of Ezra, or, if later, from the time when Johanan, the High Priest, introduced his reforms. Yet, one may ask, why did R. J. b. L. in the third century call attention to the innovation of the tithes? It was surely not pure historical interest or archaeological zeal to bring these things to the notice of scholars and laymen alike? The cause is quite simple. We find a report that in the days of this great teacher a movement originated to abolish the existing practice of giving the tithes to the priests.[27] Thereon R. J. b. L. drew the attention of the people to the sacredness of this institution. It was arranged by Ezra, yet sanctioned by the heavenly court, by God Himself! The preachers of the third century exhort by various rhetorical methods at their disposal the merits of discharging this duty, and expatiate on the great sin of neglecting this singular observance. The frequency of both in the Haggadah of the period hints at the decline of the performance of this commandment.

We turn now to the second institution in the saying of of R. J. b. L. Whatever higher or lower critics may finally suggest about the date of the composition of the Book of Esther, the Jewish teachers saw in it an ancient work of the members of the *Synagoga magna*. The rules concerning the reading of the Scroll date back to the last two centuries preceding the destruction of the Temple. They are, apart from few minor points, anonymous and without controversies, such as occur, for instance, in connexion with the Feast of the Maccabees. In the third century again the book was subjected to many criticisms, and the teachers endeavoured, as in the case of the tithes, to establish its proper place. For our purpose it may be sufficient to say that this innovation must have been of very high antiquity. The same is the case with the pronunciation of the Name in greetings. We believe that this innovation was introduced in opposition to the priests, who after the death of Simon,

[27] Pal. Maaser Sheni 56 b.

under Greek influence and Hellenistic teaching, held that God has no name, or under the misuse of the Name for magical practices prohibited the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. After a long struggle, the teachers re-established the old usage of pronouncing the Divine Name in the Temple. Moreover, even in common greetings, they succeeded with their reform. The Mishna emphasizes, having always in view an opposition to this usage, that the Name was pronounced in the Sanctuary according to its writing.[28] The בשם in the greetings must have a similar meaning, otherwise the whole institution appears superfluous and meaningless. Yet one difficult and weighty argument cannot and must not be overlooked! We think of the fact that in the Tannaitic sources, we referred to above, we find clearly stated that the Name was pronounced according to the writing in the Sanctuary only, but never in the provinces. Well, if this usage was not permitted in the divine service in the synagogues, where substitutes were used, how can we assume that the use of the Tetragrammaton was unscrupulously permitted in ordinary greetings? Secondly, even in the lessons from the Scriptures, they were commanded to change the Tetragrammaton into the substitute of it—אדני.[29] Thirdly, we are informed by a reliable eye-witness—R. Tarphon, a priest—who minutely watched and carefully observed the Blessing pronounced by the High Priest in the Temple, and he tells us, as we learnt above, that he once followed his uncle to the platform (דוכן), stood listening near the High Priest, and heard that he mingled (הבלעה) the Name with the tune of his brethren, the priests! According to the Jerushalmi

[28] v. Tamid vii. 2.

[29] v. Pes. 50 A; R. Nahman b. Isaac, לא כעולם הזה העולם הבא העוהז נכתב ביו"ד ה"י ונקרא באלף דלת אבל לעולם הבא כולו אחד נקרא ביו"ד ה"י ונכתב ביו"ד יה, b. Kid. 71 A, it is the answer of ההוא סבא to R. Abina's question; the Pal. Talmud, Sanh. 28 B, ascribes a similar saying to R. Jacob b. Aha, who explains Abba Shaul's sentence, which will be discussed later on, by נכתב ביה ונקרא בא"ד.

we have to put it that R. Tarphon stood among the priests his brethren in the same row, and directed his attention towards the High Priest, &c. As to the manner of pronouncing the Name, however, there is a consensus of all reports. It seems that even in the Temple the pronunciation was not distinct. The High Priest tried to utter the Name in such a way that the people listening to the blessing should not hear the same distinctly. How shall we imagine that ordinary people in the street were permitted to pronounce the Name in their greetings? Finally, Abba Shaul registers those who utter the Name by its letters, i. e. as it is written, among those who have no share in future life.[30] What was his attitude toward the injunction in the Mishna of Berakhot?

All these questions and arguments can be settled if we examine the relation of the Tosefta to our Mishna. The Tosefta reads: בראשונה שהיתה תורה משתכחת מישראל היו זקנים מבליעין אותה ביניהן שנ' והנה בועז וכו' ואומר יי עמך גבור חחיל.[31] Two eminent Rabbis, who were also great scholars, Dr. Perls and Dr. Szidon, dealt with this Boraita in the Hungarian Jewish Review.[32] Dr. Perls saw that our Boraita is defective and unusual. This we certainly accept. We can, however, consent neither to his suggestion, nor do we find satisfactory the solution advanced by his critic. We agree that the style of the Boraita is not what we are used to in Tannaitic sayings of a similar type. These begin with בראשונה, depicting the conditions of the good old times, and put the state of the present circumstances, adding to it the changed law or rule. That is the general experience and observation. Here the antithesis is missing. From Hillel's sentence, which is a commentary to the previous saying, we learn that the antithesis was:

[30] M. Sanh. x. 1, Aboth R N., ed. Schechter, i. 35, p. 54, this saying is mentioned in the name of R. Johanan ben Nuri. Some readings limit this prohibition to countries outside Palestine, cf. Ber. Sanh. 101 B.

[31] vii. 23, ed. Zuckermandel, p. 17, ll. 14, 16.

[32] *Magyar Zsidó Szemle*, xii, 1895, 348–56, and xiii, 1896, 207 ff.

(*a*) בשעה שהתורה חביבה על ישראל

(*b*) בשעה שהתורה משתכחת

Therefore we assume, following Dr. Perls, that between בראשונה and שהיתה תורה there must be a good deal missing. Further, it seems obscure what the verses referring to Boaz and Gideon are to prove in their present context. Examining the Mishna, we find there that the quotations from Prov. 23. 22, and Ps. 119, 126 do not fit in the context, in the Tosefta again Ruth 2. 4, and Judges 6. 12 are entirely out of place. This difficulty was raised by the earliest interpreters of the Mishna. The original text read most probably like this, gathered from the Mishna and Tosefta, the words from T. are in square brackets: התקינו [בראשונה שהיתה תורה חביבה על ישראל] שיהא אדם שואל את שלום חבירו בשם שנ' והנה בועז בא וגו' ואומר ה' עמך גבור החיל [משהיתה תורה משתכחת מישראל היו זקינים מבליעין אותה ביניהן שנ'] אל תבוז כי זקנה אמך, ואומר עת לעשות וגו'. It is especially noteworthy that the second part does not refer to the priests, but to Zekenim, scholars and spiritual leaders. Accordingly we can discern the following stages: (1) After the death of Simon the use of the Name was discontinued; (2) in the time of the early Hasidim the old custom was re-established in the Temple and extended to ordinary greetings in order to counteract Hellenistic influence; (3) with the establishment of the synagogues a line was drawn between the service in the Temple and outside; and (4) the greetings and the pronunciation in the Temple by the Name were done בהבלעה, and not distinctly. This reconstruction of the Boraita is preferable to that of Dr. Perls, who suggests the following reading: בראשונה שהיתה תורה חביבה על ישראל היו זקנים מבליעין את השם משקלקלו המינים והיה תורה משתכחת מישראל התקינו שיהא אדם שואל את שלום חבירו בשם שנ' והנה בועז וגו'. We cannot agree to this for various reasons. The reform was not directed against the early Christians, whom P. sees in the Minim of the text, but against the Hellenists whose praxis is well

established. The whole Mishna and Boraita is doubtless to be dated from the time of the Temple, and not later. Yet the הבלעה was a later development, as is seen from R. Tarphon's report, than the greeting by the Name. The quotations from Proverbs and Psalms still remain obscure according to Dr. Perls's reconstruction of the Boraita. Hillel's parallel application of the terms תורה חביבה and תורה משתכחת seems to confirm our reading. Another corroboration of this order of things can be derived from a similarly composed Boraita, which reads: ת״ר בראשונה שם בן י״ב אותיות היו מוסרין אותו לכל אדם משרבו הפרוצים היו מוסרים אותו לצנועים שבכהונה וצנועים שבכהונה מבליעים אותו בנעימות אחיהם הכהנים.[33] This Boraita is parallel to our re-established Tosefta and Mishna. For both the more general custom prevailed at first, and was altered later. There can be no shadow of a doubt that the שאל בשם is the primary, and מבליעין the secondary degree of piety. Similar Tannaitic reports are preserved in the Palestinian Talmud. The first reads: בראשונה היה אומרו בקול גבוה משרבו הפרוצין היה אומרו בקול נמוך. The second sounds similarly: בראשונה הוא נמסר לכל אדם משרבו הפרוצין לא היה נמסר אלא לכשרים.[34] The first refers to the High Priest. In earlier periods the High Priest pronounced the Name in a loud voice, since *the Peruzim* increased it was uttered in a low voice. We may here suggest that קול נמוך is identical with בהבלעת נעימת הכהנים. The second is the same as the Boraita in the Babli, when we see in the כשרים the צנועים שבכהונה. *Graetz* is inclined to see in the Simon the Just of the report Simon b. Boethos Kantheras, who was raised to the High Priesthood by Agrippa I after the dismissal of Anan b. Anan.[35] There are weighty objections

[33] v. B. Kiddushin 71 A, as to the term צנוע; v. Simon, הצנוע, Tos. Kelim i. 1, 6, and other passages; Büchler, *Priester und Cultus*, Wien, 1895, 22; v. also b. Nidda 12 A: כל המקיים דברי חכמים נקרא צנוע, v. also Cant. r. 3. 11: בראשונה היו מוסרין אותו לכל אדם משרבו הפושעים התקינו שלא יהו מוסרין אותו אלא לצנועים שבכהנה והצנועין שבכהונה היו מבליעין אותו בתוך נעימת הכהנים.

[34] Yoma 40 D (iii. 7).

[35] *MGWJ.*, 30, 1881, 108.

to an otherwise very ingenious hypothesis, the difficulties and improbabilities of which were not hidden from our great historian. The treatises Yoma and Tamid, which are of the period before the Destruction do not know of the fact that the Name was not pronounced according to its writing. It is also impossible to see in the term שנמנע מלברך בשם the equivalent of מבליעים אותו. Then, if the pronunciation was stopped, what was the good of handing on the Name to the pious priests? Finally, if the pronunciation was not heard at all, how could the people respond with בשכמל"ו? Apart from all these difficulties, Graetz cannot present the slightest corroborating facts for the 'piety' of the High Priest Kantheras, and a reason for his surname 'the Just'. Moreover, is it not more likely that the compilers or copyists, who attribute to him the proclamation about Caius Caligula, confused him with Simon the Just I, whom they credited with such prophetic powers? The piety of Agrippa I surely could not make Simon Kantheras enjoy, or attain to, the title of הצדיק.

Whilst Graetz was inclined to establish that the prohibition was the final stage in the history of the Name, his pupil, B. Jacob, who contributed a very important and erudite work on our subject [36] comes to the conclusion that the latest tendency gave the use of the Name quite free to every one in order to counteract Gnostic and Christian tendencies. The action of the priests after the death of Simon the Just is limited to a day's duration, or to the time of the surviving contemporaries. This is so done because, otherwise, the difficulties would be insurmountable.[36a] We tried to find a key to open the gate of these difficulties. Dr. Jacob's theory would not be acceptable, even if the riddle could not be solved, for a good many reasons. How does Dr. Jacob account for all the sources, which are older than Gnostic and Christian influences, and which permit and encourage the use of the Tetragram-

[36] *Im Namen Gottes*, Berlin, 1903.

[36a] v. Tosefta Yadaim, p. 684, l. 6. שאתם מזכירים את השם.

maton? How does he explain the undoubted antipathy of the Palestinian as well as Alexandrian Jews in the earliest period against the use of the Tetragrammaton, before magicians could have availed themselves of it? It has often been pointed out, and found very strange that the author of the Scroll of Esther never mentions the Name of God. Yet the matter seems so simple. The author lived in an age and in a country where and when the pronunciation of the Name was strictly forbidden. It is exactly the time after the death of Simon the Just. The Bible translators in Egypt must have lived at the same period and brought this Halakhah with them from their native country. The Samaritans accepted also the law that the Tetragrammaton must not be pronounced, but substituted the same by אלהים or שמא.[37] One cannot get over the difficulty that there was a time when the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton was strictly forbidden. The Hellenistic writer Artapan relates a Midrash: 'Moses released by supernatural power from prison went to the royal palace, found the gates open, the guards fast asleep, awoke the king, who was at first terrified at the sight of Moses, then told him mockingly *to name the God who sent him.* Moses *whispered* the name in the king's ear, whereupon the king dropped down; *caught* by Moses he revived. Later on Moses wrote the Name on a tablet and sealed it. A priest who blasphemed the writing died in great agony.'[38] Whatever *Jacob Freudenthal* thought of this writer and his work,[39] we may cite him for a witness that the Jews in his time and environment would not be inclined to pronounce the Tetragrammaton. The king asked for *God's Name.* Moses whispers, but does not pronounce the same. All these materials show clearly that the report of the Rabbinic writings about the contemporaries of Simon the Just is reliable and has to be

[37] Cf. ברמי שומרון, ed. Kirchheim, p. 94 ff.; Gaster, M., *The Samaritans*, p. 67. Pal. Sanh. xi. 1; Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 262; Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, ii. 601.

[38] Euseb., *Praep. Ev.* 18. 23. 27.

[39] *Hellenistische Studien*, p. 143 f.

seriously and earnestly considered by students of that period and on the Name of God. The difficulties presented can, however, be removed when we assume that at some later period the innovation of the priests became antiquated and was removed by a reform, which made it a duty to pronounce the Name in greetings. We saw that the custom of הבלעה followed this reform. The text of the Mishna and Tosefta, as re-established above, confirms this.

Yet we have other proofs at our disposal to show that the custom of הבלעת השם was the usual one in the last decades of the Temple. R. Judah b. Ilai, who is a very reliable historical witness, tells us that at the processions around the altar the words אני והו הושיעה נא, and not אנא יי, were uttered.[40] The Rabbanan do not know of it. They know of אנא ה'. It is clear that there can be no contradiction or a controversy about facts. R. Judah as well as the teachers of that Mishna, could have consulted eye-witnesses by asking them: What did the people say at such and such an occasion? There must have been among scholars and unlearned, priests and laymen alike, in the earlier part of R. Judah's life, men of standing who could have satisfied R. Judah's or his opponents' curiosity on this point. Yet the matter is quite in agreement with the facts. The first part of the Mishna describes the earlier custom which prevailed before they introduced the הבלעה; R. Judah refers to the later usage in the last decade or perhaps decades of the existence of the Temple. The second part of the Mishna, where we read that they surrounded the altar seven times on the day of the *Arabah*, teaches that in taking leave from the altar was said: יופי לך מזבח, lit. 'Beauty unto thee, altar', which sounds rather strange. Scholars recognized that יופי is really a substitute for God's Name.[41] This Mishna was already altered according to R. Judah, or taught according to his views. An older Tannaite, R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos said that ליה ולך מזבח was uttered, and preserved the original words.

[40] M. Sukka, iv. 5. [41] v. esp. Blau, *Das Altjüd. Zauberwesen*, p. 115.

A second instance leads away from the precincts of the Temple to the Courts of Law, where life and death was decreed. The Mishna teaches that a man who blasphemed God is not guilty of death unless he uttered the Tetragrammaton according to its writing.[42] The Mishna must have been taught when people knew the proper pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, before the restrictions of publishing the same abroad were issued, before the institution of the הבלעה, and after the period which followed the death of Simon the Just I. Similarly to the יופי = God (Tetragrammaton), R. Joshua b. Korha relates that יוסי was applied instead of God (Tetragrammaton). It is to be noticed that both יופי as well as יוסי contain four letters like the Tetragrammaton.[42a]

Before we enter into an inquiry as to the nature of the greetings referred to in our source, and the reason for pointing it out in the third century, we have to settle another historical report. We are told that a day was especially marked, e.g. the 3rd of Tishri, in the Jewish calendar, on which the אדכרתא was removed from the public documents.[43] Let us consider the original text first: בשלשה בתשרי אתנטילת (בטילה) אדכרתא מן שטריא. On the 3rd of Tishri the אדכרתא was taken away or annulled from the documents. In the Scholion, and in the Babylonian Talmud we read: שגזרה מלכות יון גזרה שלא להזכיר שם שמים על פיהם ובשגברה מלכות חשמונאי ונצחום התקינו שיהו מזכירין שם שמים אפילו בשטרות וכך היו כותבים בשנת כך וכך ליוחנן כהן גדול לאל עליון ובששמעו חכמים בדבר אמרו למחר זה פורע את חובו ונמצא שטר מוטל באשפה וביטלום ואותו היום עשאוהו וגו׳. In the Scholion there are a few variants. First: שהוא משמש לאל

[42] M. Sanh. 55 B.

[42a] D. Oppenheim, *Kobak's Jeschurun*, iv. 1864, German part 90–98 identifies יוסי with Jovis, I. Levy, ibid., Hebr., pp. 4–6 with Jesus, the son of Josef. Needless to say that neither explanation can be considered satisfactory.

[43] Meg. Taanith, ch. 7; B. R. H. 18 B; Geiger, *Urschrift*, 33; Graetz, *Geschichte*, iii. 2, 572; Bornstein in *Hatekufah*, viii. 289; and S. Zeitlin, *Megillat Taanith*, Philadelphia, 1922, p. 97 f.

ובששמעו חכמים בדבר אמרו וכי מזכירין שם שמים בשטרות ועלין, and למחר, a sentence which was omitted by the copyists of the Talmud.[44] This text deserves a careful analysis.

First of all we have to investigate the term ארכרתא. In all our sources on this subject we find the word שם for the Tetragrammaton. R. Jose ha Gelili and R. Tarphon use this term denoting the Tetragrammaton with reference to the Books of the Minim.[45] Yet one may reasonably doubt whether this is the original term for the Tetragrammaton. This term never occurs in old Tannaitic sources. We can trace it only from the time of the Boraita collector and compiler, R. Hijja, who was a half-Tannaite, and onwards. R. Hijja says: השומע אזכרה בזמן הזה אינו חייב לקרוע, 'He who hears the Azkarah in this time need not rend his garments'.[46] The discussion of the Talmud qualifies this statement to the use of the substitutes of the Name by a non-Jew. Samuel taught: השומע אזכרה מפי העובד כוכבים אינו חייב לקרוע.[47] A Jew who hears the Azkarah from a Gentile need not comply with the duty of קריעה, i.e. rending his garments. R. Jonathan b. Eliezer says that the books of the last three prophets contain 93 Azkaroth.[48] R. Hona examined the books and found only 83. Both sayings are rather surprising. We find the Name in Haggai 30 times, in Zechariah 126 times, and in Malachi 46 times. How do the facts agree with the teacher's assertion that they are mentioned 93 or 83 times respectively? Yet, omitting the Names, where the Tetragrammaton is connected with צבאות, &c., we find the Name in Haggai 15 times, in Zech. 72, and in Malachi 19, which amounts to 106. Eliminating now 13 passages where the Name occurs twice we get the total pointed out by R. Jonathan. Yet what does this artificial calculation teach us? Nothing less than the very important fact that the Tetragrammaton alone was called Azkarah or Adkartha. Such appellations as יי צבאות, or

[44] v. *Meg. Taan.*, ed. Amsterdam, 1711, Prague, 1795.
[45] Tos. Sabb. 13. 5. and parall. [46] v. b. Sanh. 60 A.
[47] b. Sanh. 60 A. [48] pal. Hag. 79 D; R. S. b. N. in his name.

אלהים ,י or אלהי ישראל ,י are not included. R. Nathan b. Abishalom, who took part in a discussion, or whose view is mentioned together with that of R. Jose b. Halafta and R. Jonathan b. Joseph, says of the בעל קרי that he may study the Talmud אם מציע את הגמרא ובלבד שלא יאמר אזכרות שבהן.[49] He must have belonged to the Amoraic period, otherwise the term גמרא would be out of place. Here the אזכרות again refer to the Tetragrammaton Rabba b. R. Huna speaks of the one אזכרה that was on the ציץ, and the many אזכרות, which are to be found in the phylacteries.[50] *R. Hillel, the son of R. Samuel b. Nahmani*, sees in the Eighteen Benedictions a parallel to the 18 אזכרות in Ps. 29; *R. Joseph*, in the 18 אזכרות of the שמע.[51] The Babylonian Amora counts אלהים as Azkaroth. The teaching of R. S. b. N. is reported in the Pal. Talmud by R Levi, כנגד י"ח הזכרות שכתוב בהבו לי בני אלים[52] and R. Abba of קרטנינא, as to the Nine Benedictions for the New Year's Day, כנגד תשע אזכרות שכתוב בפרשת חנה.[53] R. Hoshaja, R. Judah b. Simon in his name, counted from Gen. 1. 1 to Gen. 3. 17 71 Azkaroth. Since the Tetragrammaton occurs only 16 times, and אלהים 39 times, we must assume that R. Hoshaja reckoned 39 (אלהים) + 16 (י) + 16 (י אלהים), together 71.[54] R. Hoshaja, who lived in Caesarea, kept to the Babylonian tradition in seeing in Elohim also an Azkarah, which did not agree with the Palestinian praxis. We may derive

[49] b. Ber. 22 A.

[50] b. Men. 36 B; b. Sabb. 12 B; Yoma 7 B.

[51] Deut. 6. 4–9 (three times), 11. 13–21 (four times), Num. 15. 37–41 (four times); one must therefore add: אלהים and אלהיכם (seven times in Num.), אלהיך, אלהינו (twice in Deut. ch. 6), and אלהיכם (once in ch. 11), together 7 and 11 = 18; v. also Lev. 5. 1–8.

[52] pal. Ber. 8 A; pal. Taanith 65 c; Tanh. B., i. 71 B. Similar explanations are being advanced by R. Judan ענתוריא as to the Seven Benedictions for Sabbath, כנגד ז' אזכרות שכתוב במזמור שיר ליום השבת Ps. ch. 92. Here again אלהינו in v. 14 is not counted.

[53] v. 1 Sam. 2. 1–10, where כאלהינו ver. 2, and אל דעות ver. 3, are not counted; vide also pal. Taanith 65 c, where we read ענתו דריא and קרתיננא respectively.

[54] Gen. r. 20. 6; Num. r. 14. 12; M. Tadshe, ch. 10.

from our material the conclusion, that אזכרה was used since the latest Tannaim and first Amoraim to denote the Mishnaic שם. It is now most surprising that we find in the M. T. אדכרתא, and not השם. It seems that איתנטלית השם or בטילת השם would sound too drastic, therefore the rather unusual אדכרתא was put in its place. Let us turn to the Scholion! Here it is distinctly stated that the Greeks prohibited the mentioning of the name of Heaven. R. Simon b. Lakish, in the third century, had a similar historical tradition. The Jews were commanded to write on the horn of the ox: 'We have no share in the God of Israel',[55] which perfectly agrees with the word of the Scholion, ואמרו להם אין לכם חלק באלהי ישראל. Here we have the real explanation for the action of the priests after the death of Simon the Just. Hellenistic opposition to the religion of the Jews, the apostasy of the priests and nobles, introduced and established the rule not to pronounce the Tetragrammaton in the Sanctuary. The reaction came before, or in the time of the Hasmoneans. One counter-action we saw already in the rule to use the Name of God in greetings. The second was in the formulary of documents. According to the Boraita, they wrote, 'in the year so and so of X, High Priest to the Highest God'. Yet what did they write in the time of a king, who did not adorn the dignity of the High Priests? Or was the custom in use only as long as the High Priests were the highest dignitaries? When was this usage abolished? Geiger, who is followed by Zeitlin, dates it to the Roman period, to the time of the great wars against the Romans, i.e. 65 C.E. It was the work of Menahem, son of the scribe Judas, the Galilean.[56] Is it likely that the M. T. would celebrate a victory of the enemies of the Pharisees? Further, why did they eliminate the Name of God, and not that of the High Priest, since the Jews 'were subject to God alone'?

[55] Mekhilta 71 B; Gen. r. 2. 4; v. Marmorstein, *Jahrbuch für Jüd. Volkskunde*, i. 307 f.

[56] Zeitlin, pp. 98 f.

We would expect that they removed the ruler's name, and not the Name of God. One cannot grasp the objection of the Greeks to the term אל עליון, that was well known, and frequently to be found with them as well. Finally, the question of the Galilean proves the praxis that the Name, the שם, was still in use in documents in the time before the destruction of the Temple. We are therefore obliged to accept the view that we have here a victory of the Pharisees over the Sadducees.[57] It is the same development which we find established in the history of the pronunciation of the Name. Ed. Baneth[58] came to a similar result as to the date and origin of the passage in M. T. and the M. Ber. without basing his theory on the report as to the conduct of the priests after the death of Simon. Baneth thinks that the institution of greeting with the divine Name is connected with the movement ascribed by him to Jewish sects, who endeavoured to remove the divine Names מקום and שמים, and substitute in their place טובים. Why should the Rabbis object to טובים, and prefer מקום or שמים? The name טובים, or טוב, is actually used in Rabbinic sources for God. The real reason for this institution must be sought somewhere else.

A reminiscence of this struggle for the pronunciation, and against the use, of the Tetragrammaton can be seen in some of the Psalms. Notably in Ps. 129. Israel may rightly say: 'Many a time have the nations afflicted me from my youth' (verse 1). Egypt, Assur, Babylon, the Medes, and now the Greeks. Yet they have not prevailed against Israel (ver. 2). Some of these, at one time mighty enemies, are in the dust; Israel is still alive. They plowed like plowers on Israel's back. God in his righteousness has cut asunder the cords of the wicked (verses 3–4). All the haters, enemies of Zion, are confounded and turned back (ver. 5). They may become as the grass on the housetops,

[57] v. Graetz, *Geschichte*, iii A. 572.

[58] *Ursprung der Sadokäer und Boethosäer*, Berlin, 1882, p. 53 f.

which withereth afore it groweth up (ver. 6). The next sentence seems artificial at the first sight. The mower filleth not his hands, nor he that bindeth sheaves his bosom (ver. 7). And the passers-by did not say: 'The Blessing of " be upon you: we bless you in the name of "' (ver. 8). Who are the enemies of Zion? Why did they not greet with the old greeting of Boaz any more? (Ruth 2. 4). The enemies are the Jews who joined the Greeks in removing the Name, and even when the Scribes re-established the old greetings, they, the Hellenists, still refrained from applying it. The same background must be ascribed to Psalms 128 and 134. The man who feareth God must be blessed with the words: יברכך " מציון (128. 4 f), and not, as it was done before, without employing the Tetragrammaton. Ps. 134 concludes, after having appealed to bless the Lord, with the blessing: יברכך " מציון עושה שמים וארץ (ver. 3). The same is the case in Ps. 135 (ver. 21). The house of Israel, the house of Aaron, and those who fear the Lord are invited to bless the Lord (verses 19–20). Even those who fear God need not refrain from uttering the Tetragrammaton in their benedictions and greetings. This psalmist, or these psalmists, may have been contemporaries of Ben Sira, who alludes in an unmistakable manner to this movement among his people. In ch. 41. verses 17–22 he enumerates things of which man should and must be ashamed, which are followed by a catalogue of virtues of which one need not be ashamed. Graetz rightly saw in these portions a very valuable historical source, which throws light on the religious and social conditions of the author's period and enabled him to establish Sirah's approximate date. We draw attention especially to ch. 41, ver. 20 A: 'Be ashamed of keeping silent when you are greeted'. The Hebrew has two versions: (*a*) משיואל שלום מהחריש, and (*b*) משאול שלום מחריש. The second reading means: 'to greet silently', and the first: 'not to return a greeting, keeping silent, when greeted'. It is true that the Rabbis rebuke the proud who do not return their fellow men's

greeting.[59] Yet it is hardly to be believed that Sirah meant the same. He, surely, wanted to say more than that the rich are too haughty in their dealings with the poor; that they are ashamed to accept the greetings of their less fortunate brethren. It does not fit in the context, rebuking impudence, falsehood, treachery, larceny, breaking covenant and oath, inhospitality, cruelty, adultery, and sexual immorality. Surely he meant that people refrained from using the 'Name' in their greetings, or, at least, have been ashamed of doing so.[59a]

We arrived at the question, What was the meaning of these greetings? Why did the scribes emphasize their importance and attach to it the Tetragrammaton? We are told that R. Johanan b. Zakkai greeted Jews as well as heathens, even before they saluted him.[59b] Did R. Joh. b. Z. use the Tetragrammaton? Did he pronounce the name in greeting Jews and Gentiles alike? R. Meir and R. Judah speak of two kinds of greetings. Greetings out of honour, and those out of fear.[60] A Boraita teaches: הנכנם לבית המרחץ מקום שב"א עומדין לבושין יש שם מקרא ותפלה וא"צ לומר שאילת שלום ומניח תפילין ואצ"ל שאינו חולץ. In a bath, where people stood dressed, one can read the Bible, deliver the prayer; needless to say that they may greet each other, &c. Where people stood dressed and naked, there greetings were exchanged, but there was no room for reading and prayer. Where people stood naked there was no place for greetings.[61] The distinction made between reading and prayer on one side and between greetings on the other side suggests that the latter were not on the same high level as the former. From the discussion of the Amoraim it appears

[59] b. Ber. 6 B. R. Helbo in the name of R. Huna. כל שיודע בחבירו שרגיל ליתן לו שלום יקדים לו שלום.

[59a] v. now Marmorstein, *Zur Erklärung von Jes.* 53, in *ZAW.*, N. S., iii (1926), p. 263.

[59b] b. Ber. 17 A, אמרו עליו על רבן יוחנן בן זכאי שלא הקדימו אדם שלום מעולם ואפלו נכרי בשוק.

[60] Mishna, Ber. ii. 1.

[61] Tosefta Berakoth 2. 23; pal. Ber. 4 c; b. Shabb. 10 A.

that in their time the Tetragrammaton was not used any more. Had they still used it, one would never allow it to be pronounced in a place where people were naked. In the third century we hear of scholars who went to greet (סלק למשאל בשלמי הדר) their teachers or friends, as R. Jochanan b. Nappaha went to R. Haninah b. Hama,[62] and R. Levi [63] to the Patriarch of his time.[64] R. Johanan b. Nappaha was very angry with R. Eleazar b. Pedath, who did not greet his master and colleague. The Babylonians were rather backward in this respect. Another Babylonian contemporary, Zeiri, neglected also this sign of respect towards his teacher.[65] R. Johanan teaches us further that the greeting was expressed by the words שלום עליך רבי ומורי.[66] The same phrases of greetings were exchanged between R. Jose b. Halafta and Elijah.[67] R. Jose b. Qisma met a stranger, and we read that they exchanged greetings.[68] Babylonian scholars sent greetings to their Palestinian friends.[69] Certain rules as to greetings were laid down by various teachers.[70] The preachers liked to refer in their sermons to this custom of greetings.[71] Certain families had the privilege of greeting the Patriarch every day.[72] In all these instances we may safely gather that the old custom was already abolished. It is true that the Scribes saw in the word שלום a name of God, but the old greeting with the Tetragrammaton ceased. Yet there was actuality in this point of R. J. b. L.'s saying, just as the references to the

[62] Gen. r. 5, 6 ; Lev. r. 10. 9 ; 21. 7 ; Pes., ed. Buber, 177 A.

[63] Or R. Simon b. Lakish. [64] Gen. r. 78. 15 ; 80. 1.

[65] pal. Ber. 4 B ; v. also pal. MK. 83 c, pal. Shek. 16 c.

[66] pal. Ber. 4 B, v. B. B. K. 73 B. [67] v. b. Ber. 3 A.

[68] נתן לו שלום והחזיר ושלום ; v. Kinjan Tora, M. 9, Tractate Derek Erets r. ch. vi.

[69] b. Ber. 9 B.

[70] v. Rab b. Ber. 14 A, before prayers ; Ulla, b. Sabb. 10 B, in the bath ; R. Huna, b. Ber. 6 B, &c.

[71] v. R. Akiba ; Cant. 2. 19 ; Gen. r. 45. 5 ; R. Meir, ושאל בשלמה של עלובה ; Deut. r. 4. 8 ; Cant. r. 7. 4 ; Tanh. B. ii. 80, and other instances.

[72] pal. Sabb. 13 c ; Hor. 48 c ; Jeb. 12. 3 B ; Sachs, *Beiträge*, i. 17 ; *MGWJ.*, 1885, 481.

reading of the Scroll and the tithes were not arbitrary or theoretical. For in this time, in the first half of the third century, a great change in the use of the name of God is to be noticed, which brought about many changes in Jewish theological and philosophical lore, the influences of which are felt up to this very day. This will be the subject of the next chapter. Yet, before concluding this chapter, we have to point out that the knowledge of the 'Name' was not yet extinct. Samuel heard a Persian woman cursing her son with one letter of the Name.[73] A doctor of medicine in Sepphoris wanted to teach R. Phinehas b. Hama the use of the Name.[74] Similar stories are related about R. Haninah b. Hama and Aninai b. Nahson. According to Pirke R. Eliezer[75] the President of the Academy in declaring the New-Moon pronounced the Tetragrammaton in the same way as the High Priest on the Day of Atonement.

[73] pal. Yoma 3. 7.

[74] Ibid. Eccl. r. 3. 11.

[75] Ch. 8, v. *JQR.*, xiv, 1902, 469.

II

The Names of God in the Bible.

THE Mishna gives an official list of the divine Names of the Bible for several purposes. Mishna Shebuot, iv. 10, teaches: 'If a man said "I put an oath on you, I command you (by oath), I bind you (by oath)", he is guilty; "By heaven and earth", he is free; By the names (*a*) א״ד, (*b*) י״ה, (*c*) שדי, (*d*) צבאות, (*e*) חנון ורחום, (*f*) ארך אפים, (*g*) רב חסד, and (*h*) by all the substitutes, then he is guilty.'[1] This list contains two difficulties. First of all that the name אלהים, or אל, is altogether omitted. Secondly, that א״ד is mentioned before י״ה, and is called a real name, whilst it ought to be treated as one of the substitutes. A second catalogue of names, which may be deleted in writing, or may not be treated so, gives under the latter category: (*a*) אל with all its composites, (*b*) אהיה אשר אהיה, (*c*) א״ד, (*d*) י״ה, (*e*) שדי, and (*f*) צבאות, and in the first category are added to (*c*), (*d*), and (*e*) of the Mishna also: הגדול, הגבור הנורא האדיר והחזק והאמיץ וחעזוז.[2] The omission of אלהים in the M. is to be ascribed to the fact that all sayings with that name belong to a group of curses (אלה). The order of א״ד and י״ה is kept in the Boraita as well. The treatise of Soferim adds[3]: אבל רחום וחנון וארך אפים ורב חסד מלך מלכים גדול עליון צדיק וישר חסיד תמים גבור הרי אלו נמחקין. The chief divine names are also given in the introductory words of the Book of Yezira: יה ה׳ צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים חיים אל שדי רם ונשא שוכן עד וקדוש.[4]

Reviewing these names we notice that some of them occur even in the Bible only once, some are repeated only a few times, others occur more or less frequently. They

[1] M. Shebuoth, *Yer. and Babli* חנון ורחום as God's names occur also Sifre, Deut., § 49, Midr. Tannaim, p. 43.

[2] b. Sheb. 35 A; Soferim, iv. 1; A. R. N. 34. 2, v. also a Tanhuma fragment in Yalkut Makhiri Psalms, 92, 26.

[3] iv. 9.

[4] v. about the readings פירוש ס׳ יצירה, by Judah b. Barzili of Barcelona, ed. S. Halberstamm, Berlin, 1885, p. 116.

are landmarks in the religious development and education of the old Hebrews and Israelites. The most ardent intellectual endeavours and religious zeal are attached to these names, which left their indestructible marks and irremovable imprints on the mind and soul of the whole world. Whatever moderns may think of those prophets and priests who uttered them for the first time, and grew not weary in repeating them, these Names prepared for the religious enlightenment of the world. His Name became great among the nations all over the earth from sunrise to sunset (cf. Mal. 1. 11). A psalmist calls upon all the nations to sing and praise Him, whose Name became the guide and comfort of the whole world (Ps. 117. 1). Yet some of these names have never been repeated, at least not in their original form. The divine Name אהיה אשר אהיה is mentioned only once (Exod. 3. 14). The name שדי is more frequent. The teachers of the third century endeavour to explain the meaning of this term. All of them see in it a kind of notarikon: אני הוא שאמרתי לעולם די, 'I am He, who said to the World, Enough!' meaning that otherwise the creation of heaven and earth would never have been completed.[5] There was an older interpretation by R. Eliezer b. Jacob, who sees in שדי the idea that the whole universe and all the fullness thereof is not worthy (כדיי) of the Godhead. The Haggadist quotes the Greek words of Aquilas' translation: ἄξιος and ἱκανός. The first word means 'everlasting' and the second 'all powerful'.[6]

The name צבאות gave rise to several explanations. What

[5] *Rab* (*R. Judah b. Ezekiel in his name*); *R. Simon b. Lakish*, Hag. 12 A; *R. Alexander Tanh.* i. 202; *R. Abbahu*; Tanhuma, בראשית, 12; i. 80, i. 197; *R. Aha* (trans. by R. Nathan), and *R. Isaac* (trans. by R. Berekhja; Gen. r. 5, ed. Theodor. pp. 37 and 460); *R. Hoshaja* (trans. by R. Phinehas b. Hanna, Gen. r. 92. 1), and *Pirke R. E.*, ch. 3.

[6] Gen. r. ch. 17. 1, ed. Theodor, 401; v. also Tanh. i 80; Levy, *H. W. B.*, s. vv. אקסיום and איקנום; Z. Frankel, *Über den Einfluss der paläst. Exegese*, Leipzig, 1851, 28; Lerner, *Quellen und Anlage*, 57; Krauss, in *Steinschneider Festschrift*, 152; Lehnwörter, s.v. and Preuschen-Bauer, *Griech-Deutsches Wörterbuch*; Giessen, 1926, col. 122 and col. 583, v. also Marmorstein, *Miscellen*, in *ZfNW*, 25, 1926, p. 253 f.

is צבאות? A sign (אות) in his hosts.[7] A notarikon which shows that the original meaning of the name was lost to the later generations. A teacher of the fourth century, R. Abba b. Kahana, R. Berekhja in his name, remarks that the name of God is Zabaoth. R. Judah b. Simon adds, 'even one letter of His name is capable of creating hosts as the the whole of His name'.[8] In Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek magic צבאות is put together with *ια ια αδωναι σαβαωθ*.[9] R. Eleazar b. Pedath emphasizes that Hannah was the first to use this name.[10] The teachers add: Hannah saw the multitudes of Israel in the precincts of the Temple, and she said in her prayer: 'Thou hast brought forth all these multitudes (צבאות) and unto me dost Thou withhold a son?'[11]

The other names, like אד, יה and אל were also relegated to the language of prayers and magic, as will be shown in the next chapter. But before attempting to describe the history of these names in Rabbinic theology, their meaning must be dealt with at some length.

Rabbinic lore preserved the teaching that the Tetragrammaton implies or expresses the measure of love and mercy; the name Elohim, that of judgement. Philo taught just the reverse; the term *θεός* = אלהים means *εὐεργέτης*, the good, the God of love and benevolence; *κύριος* = אדני expresses God's Lordship, Rulership, Judgement. *Dähne*, the old, but not antiquated, historian of Jewish-Hellenistic philosophy of religion, wrote about ninety years ago: 'Philo names the benevolent world-creating power (*δύναμις*) God (*θεός*), and the mighty world-ruling power Lord (*κύριος*). Philo himself asserts that in doing so he relies on the usual phraseology.'[12] Many passages in Philo's works confirm this statement. The first modern Jewish

[7] צבא, Mekh. 35 A. [8] Pes. r. 104 A.

[9] v. Blau, *Zauberwesen*, p. 91; b. Yoma, 84 A, and b. B. B. 73 A.

[10] b. Ber. 31 B.

[11] v. ib.; M. Samuel, ed. Buber, p. 48 f., R. Levi and R. Joshua b. Levi.

[12] *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd. alex. Religions-Philosophie*, Halle, 1834, p. 231 f.

investigator of the Septuagint, *Zacharias Frankel*, was puzzled by this view of Philo, and ascribes this great difference between the Palestinian way of thinking and between Philo's hermeneutics to the latter's ignorance of Hebrew.[13] Philo's assumed ignorance alone does not explain the great discrepancy between Alexandrinian and Palestinian teachings. Besides, Philo clearly points out that his conception goes back to reliable authorities. Who were they?

We have to examine the midrashic material at our disposal in order to see the real state of our doctrine. The first teachers in whose sayings the terms מדת הרחמים and מדת הדין occur are R. Meir and R. Simon b. Johai. R. Meir's name is attached to the saying based on Isa. 26. 21: הנה יוצא ממקומו ה׳ ממדה למדה ממדת הדין למדת הרחמים. 'God goes out from His place? God is omnipresent! How could it be that He goes from one place to another? It was taught in the name of R. Meir that He changes the measure of judgement with that of mercy.' Apparently the meaning is: ה׳ (the measure of mercy) steps in the place of אלהים (the measure of judgement).[14] R. Simon b. Johai sees in אל, Ps. 36. 7, an allusion to God's judgement.[15] The doctrine that the term אלהים means judge is several times ascribed to R. S. b. J. Yet the old Tannaitic Haggada does not seem to know the terms מדת הרחמים and מדת הדין.[15a] Instead we read the terms מדה טובה and מדה פורענות, 'the

[13] v. *Vorstudien in der LXX*, Leipzig, 1851, p. 178 f., esp. his note, and *Über den Einfluss der palästinensischen Exegese auf die alex. Hermeneutik*, Leipzig, 1851, p. 26.

[14] v. pal. Taanith 65 B; Pesikta, ed. Buber, 162 A and 164 A, where the text can be completed with the help of Yalkut Makhiri on Hosea, ed. Greenup, 2.

[15] v. Tanh., ed. Buber, i. 34; Ag. Ber. 4. 1. See, however, Pes., ed. Buber, 73 A; Lev. r. 27; Gen. r. 33; M. Ps. ch. 36, cf. Lev. r, 27. 1, Tanh. B. iii. 71.

[15a] The dispute between R. Ishmael and R. Akiba, whether אלהים in Ex. 22. 27 means "God", or "Judge", could not have arisen if the later meaning of Elohim had been known in their days, v. Mekh. 79 A, b. Sanh. 66 A, pal. Sanh. 7. 8, Soferim 4, 5.

measure of goodness and the measure of punishment'. A saying of R. Meir contains the latter, and not the former terms. 'Whence do we derive that one must bless God for the good as well as for the evil?' because it says, 'Which the Lord thy God has given thee'. He is thy judge in all judgements He passes on thee, whether with the measure of goodness or with that of punishment.[16] The Tannaitic Midrash usually adopts these earlier terms.[17] None of these, however, enables us to glance at the inner meaning of the use made of the divine name. One can see in ה׳ the מדת פורענות, and in אלהים the measure of goodness, or *vice versa*. Yet a few passages show clearly that not only Philo but even the older Rabbis did not know of the exegetical norm we are dealing with, in spite of being well acquainted with the Hebrew Bible, a knowledge of which Philo could not boast, according to Frankel. In Mekhilta 8 A we read: אני יי בישבועה אני נפרע מהם קו״ח ומה אם מדת פורענות מעוטה אמר הקב׳ה לעשות ועשה מדה טובה מרובה ע״א כו״כ. Here the name יי occurs, and it is understood to convey the meaning of a threat, a future punishment in case of disobedience. Although the Midrash of the Tannaim contains the rule of מדת הרחמים = ה, and מדת הדין = אלהים,[18] yet the text never uses these terms, but always the older terms מדת טובה and מדת פורענות. In one place the new term, מדת הרחמים, is actually used, but not with reference to ה׳. Mekh. 37 A contains a text, reading: אל אלהי אבי עמי נהג במדת רחמים ועם אבותי נהג במדת רחמים ומנין שאין אלי אלא מדת רחמים שנ׳ אלי אלי למה עזבתני, ואומר אל נא רפא נא לה, ואומר אל יי ויאר לנו. 'God, the God of my father. He treated me with the measure of mercy, just as He treated my father with the same measure.' Whence

[16] b. Ber. 48 B; also Hijja b. Nahmani; Mekh. 19 B; Tosefta, 14, p. 181; v. also R. Akiba, Mekh. 72 B.

[17] v. M. 7 B, 26 A: ומה אם מדה פורענות מעוטה מי שהתחיל בעבירה קו״ח ומה אם מדת פורענות, 14 A; לוקה תחלה קו״ח למדת טובה שמרובה מועטת העושה בסתר הקב׳ה מפרסמו בגלוי מדה טובה מרובה ע״א כו״כ; 49 A; 68 B. R. Eleazar of Modiim, 95 B, 100 A; Sifre Num., § 115; Sifre Deut., § 286, and several more.

[18] Sifre Deut., § 27.

do we know that אל denotes *the measure of mercy*? From Ps. 22. 2, Num. 12. 13, and Ps. 118. 27. Friedmann corrects the texts according to Nahmanides, and earlier commentators, and changes the second מדת הרחמים in the term of מדת הדין. The correction is based on the assumption that the old Haggadah knew the norm of אלהים being the measure of judgement. That is not so. The fact is that the ancient Haggada, just like Philo, saw in ה׳ the מדת פורענות = the judgeship or rulership of God, and in אלהים the love and mercy of God. The first traces of a change of views and attitude do not lead farther than the age of R. Simon and R. Meir.[18b]

The rule is repeatedly quoted in the Midrash. The oldest mention of it is to be found in the Sifre, § 27. Here it reads: בכל מקום שנ׳ ה׳ זו מדת הרחמים כל מקום שנ׳ אלהים זו מדת הדין. For the first half of the rule we are referred to Exod. 34. 6, and for the second to Exod. 22. 8 and 27. Secondly, the first half of this rule is quoted in Gen. r. ch. 33, ed. Theodor, p. 308, in a sermon of R. Samuel b. Nahmani. The second half is cited by an anonymous preacher in Eccles. r. 7.17: באותה שעה בקשה מדת הדין לפגוע בו, דכתי׳ וידבר אלהים ואין אלהים אלא מדת הדין ונא׳ ויאמר אליו אני ה׳ א׳ל את ב׳ו. לא יכולת לסבול אותם אני ה׳ רחמן בעל הרחמים במדתי ארחם שנ׳ ויקרא ה׳ אלהים אל האדם, אין ה׳ אלא מדת הרחמים שנ׳ ה׳ ה׳ אל רחום והנון, הקדים לו מדת רחמים למדת הדין, הוי כי לא אל חפץ רשע, שאינו חפץ לחייב בריה. Num. r. 9.16: יתן ה׳ אותך אוי להם לרשעים שעושים מדת רחמים אכזריות בכ״מ שנ׳ ביוד ה״א מדת רחמים שנ׳ ה׳ ה׳ אל רחום. This Midrash uses also in another place the term מדת אכזריות instead of מדת הדין, as seen in 10. 17: כך תפלתן של צדיקים מהפכין מדת אכזריות למדת רחמניות. M. Ps., ch. 56, ed. Buber, p. 294, ascribes this rule to R. Nehorai (most of the MSS. omit this name) teaching: מקום שנ׳ אלהים הוא מדת הדין ה׳ זו מדת הרחמים. According to this information the authorship of the saying is to be

[18b] A Boraita of R. Hijja in Lev. r. 23. 9, preserved traces of the older Agada, which says: למה אני ה׳ ב׳ פעמים אני שפרעתי מדור המבול וג׳ אני עתיד ליפרע ממי שהוא עושה.

attributed to R. Nehorai. Nehorai and Meir are identical names.[19] This also bears out our suggestion that the rule was formulated by, or originated in the time of, R. Meir. The teachers of the previous generations use, as we saw, different terms. In genuine Tannaitic sources the new terms are rare; very frequent, however, the older terms מדת טובה and מדת פורענות. Some instances from the Tannaitic Midrashim have been given already above. Here other sources shall be consulted. Exod. r. 3. 18 has a sentence, written in a style which can be ascribed to an older Tannaitic Midrash, containing these terms. The passage reads: ד״א מכאן שהפורענות (r. ש מדת) שוהא על הצדיקים לבא ומדת הטוב ממהרת לבא. In the Bab. Talmud, Sabb. 97 A, the saying is quoted by Raba, according to other readings by R. Jose b. Haninah in the old Tannaitic form: מדה טובה ממהרת לבא ממדת פורענות. The Amoraim preserved, as the language shows, the original form of the sayings by earlier teachers. The Midrash השכם[20] contains a question of R. Joshua (b. Hananja): 'Which measure is greater? That of goodness, or that of punishment? Certainly the former.' Here again the Bab. Talmud preserved a fuller form of this statement.[21] Here R. Joshua proves that the measure of goodness surpasses that of punishment. If in punishment the sins of the parents are visited on their children, how much more that in the measure of goodness, i.e. reward, their children will enjoy the fruits of their deeds in the hereafter. There, by the same method, God's goodness is demonstrated as enabling the righteous as well as the wicked to bear the bounty of goodness and the severity of punishment respectively. R. Ishmael deals with the same question with reference to the faithless woman.[22] We are therefore entitled to see in passages, where these older

[19] v. B. Erubin, 13 B.

[20] ed. Grünhut, ס׳ הליקוטים, I. Jerusalem, 1892, 4 B.

[21] b. Sanh. 100 A–B; v. also b. Yoma 76 A.

[22] Sifre Num., § 9; cf. b. Sotah, 20 B; Tosefta, ch. 1; Num. r. 9. 39; similarly R. Jose, the Galilean (Sifre Num., § 15; Sotah, 28 A; Num. r. 9. 45, fuller than in the other sources).

terms occur, Tannaitic Haggada. Thus Tanh. v. 49, where we learn that all Israelites are surety for each other. If there is one righteous, the whole world stands (exists) for his sake. If one man sins, the whole generation suffers on account of him. This is the law of solidarity in Israel and the world.[23] For this the example Achan is quoted. The homily concludes: מדת פורענות מועטת והדור נתפש מדה טובה מרובה על אחת כמה וכמה. The phrase occurs in a discussion between R. Gamaliel II and R. Akiba.[24] Once we find the terms in the name of R. Simon b. Abba;[25] it is, however, doubtful whether it is not a repetition of an older saying. For in the Amoraic Haggada these terms are not used. Even in some of the sayings of R. Meir[26] and R. S. b. J.[27] the old forms are still alive. It was surely a period of transition. Their contemporaries, R. Jose b. Halafta and R. Judah b. Ilai,[28] use still the old names.[29] Yet the latter Scribe is reputed to have used the new terms. He says: כך אמר משה בשעה שאמרת לי ועתה לך ואשלחך אל פרעה במדת רחמים אמרת לי שאתה עתיד לגואלן שמא עד שבאתי נהפכה למדת הדין, א'ל הקב'ה אני ה' במדת רחמים אני עומד הוי ויאמר אליו ה'.[30] We deduce from our material that this rule, just as the terms of מדת הדין and מדת הרחמים, are not older than the middle of the second century. We traced back the earlier view, which agrees with Philo's interpretation, that ה' signifies the מדת הדין, and אלהים the מדת הרחמים to the Palestinian Haggadah.

A further proof for this observation can be advanced from the translation of the name Elohim in the literature

[23] v. Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits*, pp. 185 ff.

[24] Midr. Psalms, 119; cf. Sanh. 81 A; Maccoth, 24 A.

[25] Gen. r. ch. 9, ed. Th., p. 73.

[26] A. b. R. N. ch. 30, ed. Sch., p. 89.

[27] Tanh. i. 34: כך צדקה כובשת על מדת הדין ועל הפורענות כדי שלא יבוא לעולם, where either מדת הדין or מדת הפורענות is superfluous.

[28] Eccl. r. 4. 1, where we have to read instead of בשם ריב"ל, according to Midrash hashkem בשם ר' יהושע בן חנניה; cf. also b. Sanh. 100 A.

[29] v. Tanh. ii. 116; Exod. r. 45. 6: גל טובי מדת הטוב ומדת הפורענות.

[30] Exod. r. 6. 3.

of the Targumim. The late Chief Rabbi, Dr. Nathan M. Adler, ז"ל, one of the most successful and competent commentators of the Targum Onkelos, makes the following important remark in his general introduction to the Targum Onkelos (iv. 2): 'Behold, in the whole of the Torah the Targumist translates the name of God "Elohim" as the Tetragrammaton.' Similarly in his comments on Gen. 1. 1 (ed. Wilna, 1874, p. 3 a): 'Elohim is translated in the whole of the Pentateuch as the Tetragrammaton'. The same observation can be made in studying the Targum of the Prophets. The so-called Ps. Jonathan has some exceptions from this rule. The same can be observed in some of the Targumim of the Hagiographa. The latter are surely post-Tannaitic just as the Ps. Jonathan, which shows Amoraic influence in Halakah as well as in the Haggada. We are inclined to ask: If Onkelos really knew this most pronounced and far-reaching theological distinction of the meanings attached to the two names, Elohim the measure of judgement, Adonaj the measure of mercy, how could he ignore this rule and see in Elohim the Tetragrammaton? Surely, Onkelos is *older* than the *later* distinction of the Rabbis and agrees with Philo, who held the view that Elohim = Measure of love, and Adonaj = Measure of judgement.

The next step to be taken in the course of our investigation must be to answer the question what motives or circumstances moved the scribes to alter the established rule that ה׳ is the Lordship, Judgement of God, and אלהים the Love of God? Philo, surely, never invented these terms, but took them from Palestinian sources. There never was a discrepancy between Philo and the Rabbis in this respect. Therefore we must find a cogent reason for such a far-reaching change. What was it? R. Simon b. Johai took a conspicuous part in opposing the views and doctrines of the Dualists. These, as we are informed by Irenaeus, saw in the two Names an affirmation of their theories of two Gods. Let us quote the very words of this Church Father,

who was a contemporary of R. Simon b. Johai, and the other scribes, in whose Haggada we found the two new terms. The Bishop of Lugdunum, who is considered the father of Christian dogmatics, writes: 'If, however, any object that, in the Hebrew language, diverse expressions occur in the Scriptures, such as Sabaoth, Eloë, Adonai, and all other such terms, striving to prove from these that there are different powers and gods, let them learn that all expressions of this kind are but announcements and appellations of one and the same Being. For the term "Eloë" in the Jewish language denotes God, while Eloeim and Eloeuth in the Hebrew language signify "*that which contains all*". As to the appellation Adonai, sometimes it denotes what is nameable and admirable; but at other times, when the letter Daleth in it is doubled, and the word receives an initial guttural sound—thus, Addonai—it signifies, "One who bounds and separates the land from the water, so that the water should not subsequently submerge the land." All the other expressions likewise bring out the title of one and the same Being; as, for example, the Lord of Powers, the Father of all, God Almighty, the Most High, the Creator, the Maker, and such like.'[31] This passage leaves no doubt that the two names stood in the centre of Gnostic speculations. It seemed natural that κύριος should be interpreted as the God of the Jews, the God of rigid judgement, and Elohim, the general name of God, as the Highest God, the most perfect God, the God of love and mercy. Consequently the teachers of the middle of the second century changed the order.

Even this new interpretation did not remove all the difficulties. First of all there are very numerous passages which contradict this rule. For instance, in Gen. 8. 1, we read ויזכור אלהים את נח; here, plainly, a measure of love and mercy is spoken of, yet the text uses אלהים, v. also Exod. 2. 24, וישמע אלהים את נאקתם ויזכור אלהים, and Gen. 30. 22, ויזכור אלהים את רחל. There are many instances of יי being connected with punishments, chastisement, and threats,

[31] *Ag. Heresies*, ii. xxxv. 3, cf. *ZfNW.*, loc. cit., p. 257.

cf. Gen. 6. 5–7, and others. R. Samuel b. Nahmani deals with these verses in a homily, which says: 'Woe unto the wicked, for they change the measure of love into a measure of punishment. Blessed are the pious, who change the measure of judgement into that of love!'[32] Moses is mentioned as one typically pious, who changed the measure of judgement into that of mercy by his prayer.[33] Secondly, the אלהים in the story of creation must have given rise to many objections The creation is a sign of God's mercy and goodness. For God's glory and man's merit was the world created. Why, then, in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis is the term אלהים, and not יי, to be found? The reply to this is that the Bible does not mention the full name of God, the Tetragrammaton, before the creation was fully accomplished. A third point was, Why does the first chapter of Genesis mention the term אלהים, the measure of judgement in connexion with the creation of man? Again the preachers of the third and fourth centuries dwell on this. R. Joshua b. Levi says: 'When God created man, He created him with the two measures, and in driving him out from the garden, He applied also both measures.'[34] He means to say that neither the work of creation, nor the punishment after the sin, could have been the measure of the Demiurgos, for in both cases the two measures were jointly applied. R. Berechja preached on the same subject. When God created man, He foresaw that righteous and wicked people would come forth, and said: 'If I create man there will arise wicked people, if I do not create him, there is no chance for pious men to be born!' What did God do? He put aside the thought of the wicked, and joined the measure of mercy with that of judgement.[35]

[32] Gen. r. ch. 33, ed. Th. 308, ib. 73. 2.

[33] v. Eccles. r. 8. 1; Tanh. iv. 113; Pes. B. 36 A; Pes. r. 166 B; M. Ps. 388 r. שהכריע מדה"ד למדה"ר; the previous sources read שמשנה מדה"ד, Tanh. B. iv. 70 ינצח מדה"ד למדה"ר.

[34] Gen. r. ch. 21, ed. Th. 202, כשבראו בראו במדת הדין מדת הרחמים, וכשטרדו טרדו במדת הרחמים.

[35] Gen. r. ch. 8, ed. Th. 59; M. Ps. 1. 22; R. Eljakim, Pes. r. 166 B; R. Haninah.

An anonymous preacher varies this idea by saying: 'God said, "If I create the world with the measure of love, then sins will be too many; with that of judgement, the world cannot exist; but I will join both measures, and I wish that the world should stand."'[36] This teaching of the two measures connected with the divine name is responsible for the doctrine developed in the third century, that God does nothing without the counsel of His heavenly court, and that the term יי implies His Court of High; a doctrine which contradicts the views of the foregoing centuries. God is the only judge. He judges without assistants and counsellors. Very cogent reasons must have prevailed to change the older doctrine, which was more in accordance with the purer monotheistic belief of the Jews.[37] We conclude this investigation of the Biblical names of God with a saying of *K. Abba b. Mamal*: 'God says to Moses, "Thou wilt know my Name? I am called according to my deeds. When I judge the creatures, I am אלהים; when I fight the wicked, I am צבאות; when I leave the sins of man in suspense, I am שדי; and when I am compassionate, I am יי!"'[38] This teacher lived in the third century, and was a contemporary of R. Joshua b. Levi. What was the reason for these explanations of God's Names? R. Abba b. Kahana, also a teacher of the same age, informs us that two generations used the Tetragrammaton in their prayers: the generation of the Great Assembly and that of the שמד.[39] Some scholars[40] thought that this referred to the Hadrianic persecutions. Yet, דורו של שמד, the generation of the persecutions

[36] Gen. r. ch. 12, ed. Th., p. 112 f.; Pes. r. 167 A; M. Cant., ed. Grünhut, 39 A.

[37] For a fuller treatment of this point v. Marmorstein, 'Some Greek and Rabbinic ideas of God', in the *Jewish Chronicle Supplement*, January, 1925, pp. v–vii, where the material is given, and further on.

[38] Exod. r. 3. 6; for similar explanations of the divine names, v. also a fragment quoted in Yalkut Makhiri Psalms, 92, 26.

[39] M. Ps. 36. 3, ed. Buber, 251.

[40] v. Graetz, *Geschichte*, iv. 2. 452; Bacher, *APa.*, ii. 478; v., however, Marmorstein, 'Eine messianische Bewegung im 3ten Jahrhundert', in Dr. Wohlgemut's *Jeschurun*, xiii (1926), pp. 16–28, 171–86, and 369–83.

is distinguished from the generation of the Hadrianic persecutions in our texts.[41] R. Joshua b. Levi, who stood under the influence of the Hasidic teacher, R. Phinehas b. Jair, who taught that if Israel used the Tetragrammaton, they soon would be redeemed.[42] R. Joshua b. Levi, who lived in a time of great religious persecutions, tried to avail himself of this advice, and introduced such a 'reform'. To justify his action, he reminded his contemporaries of the ancient rule about the greetings with the Name. Other[43] liturgical innovations of a similar kind were also introduced. R. Joshua b. Levi had to face great opposition on account of his 'reforms', although he supported them with ancient precedents. R. Levi, belonging to the school of Tiberias, opposed, as we saw in the beginning of our investigation, this praxis.[44] We shall understand now why the scholars of Lydda were stigmatized by their colleagues of the North as 'haughty' people.[45] For no other reason but because they taught and thought of making use of the Tetragrammaton. This weighty and extraordinary controversy between North and South, Tiberias and Lydda, R. Joshua b. Levi and R. Johanan, led to new developments in the history of the divine name. Before attempting to describe this new departure, we have to survey the complete list of the names of God in our Rabbinic sources.

[41] v. *Jeschurun*, loc. cit., p. 183.

[42] Pes. r. ch. 22, ed. Friedmann, 114 B, מתפללים ואינן נאנים ריב"ל בשם רפב"י מפני שאינם יודעים סוד שם המפורש.

[43] v. Midr. Ps. 14. 6, B. 114: ר' יודן בשם ר' יהושע בן לוי אמר לפי שהתינוקות של בית רבן אומרים שני פעמים ביום שחרית וערבית שובנו אלהי ישענו והפר כעסך מעמנו; Ps. 85. 5; Pes. r. ch. 41, ed. Friedmann, 174 A, R. Huna, לפי ששני פעמים התינוקות אומרין בבית הכנסת אחת בבקר ואחת בערב הושיענו אלהינו לפיכך הקב'ה אומר שני פעמים מי יתן מציון. This prayer for redemption is closely connected with the Messianic expectation of the third century.

[44] v. above, p. 19.

[45] jer. Pes. 32 A; b. Pes. 63 A; *Jeschurun*, loc. cit., 184. On the sin and evil of a haughty spirit v. b. Sota, 5 A, the sayings of Mar R. Joseph, R. Eleazar, and R. Alexander; further b. Sanh. 101 B, R. Nahman; v. also R. Joshua b. Levi, b. Sanh. 43 B, and Sotah 5 B.

III

The Rabbinic Synonyms for God.

WHILST the names of God in the Bible have often been investigated during the last two thousand years, those in the Rabbinic writings have never been completely gathered and explained. The scribes speak of God's seventy names, and register them. A Midrash on Canticles enumerates them; so the later Midrash on the Alphabet, attributed to R. Akiba, but surely later than the second century.[1] The collection is by no means free from artificiality and owes its origin to the popularity of this number. Numbers, as we now know, were of great importance in popular science and mystic speculations. The number 'seventy' shared this ancient partiality. No such predilection is known in the number of God's Names in the Rabbinic writings. An attempt has been made by *E. Landau*[2] to form such a collection. This scholar enumerates fifty-seven names, some of the names are doubled, but a good many omitted altogether. We have left aside some (like נצחונו של עולם, 'the Victory of the World') which occur only in mystic writings, like the Bahir. This book is outside the sources used for our investigation. Yet our collection comprises more than

[1] v. Agadath Shir ha Shirim, ed. Schechter, p. 79, and Midrash Cant. Zutta, ed. Buber, 11, Zunz, G. V. 262; v. also Pes., p. 22 החלוץ, iv. 71, ס' חשק, Lemberg, 1865; H. B., xiv. 6; *JQR.*, vii. 731 (שערי אורה), בדי ארון, p. 35; *MGWJ.*, viii. 145; *ZDMG.*, xxxv. 167; *Jüd. Literaturblatt*, xiii, no. 7-8.

[2] *Die dem Raume entnommenen Synonyma für Gott in der neu-hebräischen Litteratur*, Zürich, 1888, 6–10; v. earlier attempts by Leop. Löw, *Die talmudische Lehre vom göttlichen Wesen, Ben Chananja*, 1866, no. 35, coll. 85–92, = *Ges. Schriften*, i. 177 ff.; and Bartolocci, *Bibliotheca magna rabbinica*, 552–642, *Diss. de Deo, sc. id quod sentiunt Rabbini Talmudistae*, full of errors and prejudice, some of them corrected by Löw.

ninety designations of God. It is needless to emphasize the wealth of religious fervour and enthusiasm, deep thought and high intelligence which lie behind these words. Many strenuous mental struggles, often lasting for centuries, phases of the conflicts between ignorance and culture, the growth of religious advancement from lower to higher stages, and the increasing war between light and darkness are concealed within these words. They bear eloquent witness to Israel's victory over gods and their temples. Products of Israel's gestation, these names fertilized in turn nations and peoples, doomed without them to decay and death.

Internally and externally they purified the air of religion, cleansed the hearts, freed them from superstition and idolatry, and brought salvation to the perishing world under the dying culture of Hellas and Rome, of Byzantium and Persia. Many spiritual forces and material tempests, many wars and revolutions of the history of the world originated these names, caused their changes, and influenced their history. The religious genius of the Rabbis in the first four centuries manifests itself as a living and imperishable source of real piety and true knowledge of God, which is unsurpassed in the history of religions. Surely teachers and preachers, who could express God's relation to men and the world's relation to God, His attributes and nature in such manifold ways and names, are entitled to be heard in all questions which bear on the problem of religion. No student of the history of religion, no searcher in the fields of religious thoughts and the philosophy of religion can pass unnoticed these works of the greatest teachers of this subject.

Our list gives ninety-one Names. This catalogue of Names may appear to some more technical. Unfortunately our branch of research is not yet furnished with the apparatus which would enable us to dispense with such investigations. Our material is arranged in alphabetical order. The chronology of the names and their frequency in different

periods of Jewish history will be dealt with in the following chapter.

The Names of God in the Rabbinic Writings.

(1) אב הרחמים

'*Father of Mercy.*' *SER.* 69. 'God, the Father of Mercy, finds it hard to destroy men who studied the Torah and Mishna and are stained by ugly conduct and unworthy deeds.' Ed. Venice reads בעל הרחמים, v. sub voce.[3]

(2) אב שבשמים

'*Father in Heaven*', also אבינו שבשמים 'Our Father in Heaven', אביכם שבשמים 'Your Father in Heaven', and אבי, אביו, אביך, אביהם. There is no basis for Kohler's assumption that this appellation is of Essene origin.[4] It is so often used by all the teachers of Judaism in the first four centuries that there is not the slightest ground for ascribing it to one sect or section of Jews. Similarly must we regard Dalman's assertion or information that this name of God does not appear in Rabbinic literature before the end of the first century.[5] Simon b. Shetach, who lived in the first century B.C.E., says to Honi, the circle drawer: 'Thou art like *a son*, who endears himself to *his father*, and his father complies with all his requests'.[6] The great pacifist,

[3] The term is very usual in liturgical pieces, v. Elbogen, *Gottesdienst*, p. 203, and second edition, p. 549; further J. Davidson, *Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry*, i, New York, 1904, nos. 37, 39†, 40, 44†.

[4] v. Kohler, *Grundriss einer systematischen Theologie*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 78, and *Hebrew Union College Annual*, i, 1924, p. 398.

[5] v. *Die Worte Jesu*, Leipzig, 1898, p. 152.

[6] v. pal. Taanith 67 A; b. Taan. 23 A: כבן שהוא מתחטא אל אביו. Pseudo-Rashi explains לשון חטא, an expression of sin, we take it, according to Aruch, s.v. חט 1, to mean ענין ענוג. The real meaning of the expression is corroborated by several Haggadic sayings. First of all by the sentence of *R. Levi*, who says: בזכות ב' דברים שישראל מתחטיין לפני המקום בזכות שבת ובזכות מעשרות בזכות שבת דכתיב אם תשוב משבת רגלך, מה כתיב בתריה אז תתענג על ה', ובזכות מעשרות דכת' ושמחת בכל הטוב, cf. Isa. 58. 13 f., Deut. 26. 11, Pes. B. 96 B, Tanh. v. 22. There are different read-

R. Johanan b. Zakkai, taught in the time of the war between Rome and Judea the greatness of spreading peace between husband and wife, cities and nations, basing his homily on the law, Exod. 20. 25, 'For the stones of the altar are peacemakers between Israel and their Father in Heaven'.[7] The same teacher uses the words: 'Blessed be the God of Israel, who gave a son to our father Abraham, who is able (knows) to expound and to grasp the glory of our Father that is in Heaven!' in blessing his pupil, R. Eleazar b. Arakh.[8] *R. Gamaliel II* sees the cause of persecutions in the days of Haman in the sad fact that the 'beloved sons of God' provoked the displeasure of their 'Father in Heaven'.[9] This saying deserves more than passing attention. First of all for the phrase '*beloved sons of God*' (בניא חביביא). Nicodemus, son of Gorion, went to the Temple and prayed: 'Lord of the world, show that there are in Thy world men loved by Thee' (אהובים).[10] Josephus speaks of a certain Onias, a righteous and God-beloved man.[11] The patriarch surely thought here of Israel in general, who are called God's (ידידים) friends, beloved.[12] The same passage furnishes us with some materials as to the inner life of the age in Judaea. It was a period of unjust judges and corrupt witnesses, of informers

ings in the texts, מתחטטין, מתחננין, and מתעננין. The verb occurs similarly in a saying of R. Eleazar b. Pedath: כל חיטטין ופרנוקין ישראל מחטין ומתפרנקין, v. Cant. r. 7. 5, cf. Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits*, 77, note 174. A clear exposition of the term מתחטא is given in the Boraita: 'The child says, Father, take me to the bath, give me nuts', &c. This sentence was inserted in order to avoid any mistake of the verb מתחטא in the sense of Pseudo-Rashi. R. Abbahu in the name of R. Jose b. Hanina uses the verb in the sense of privileges, rights, when he says: כמה מתחטאין ויש להם פתחון פה לעושה מצוה, v. Tanh. v. 45. The underlined words are here again put as a commentary to the otherwise difficult מתחטאין; v. also Büchler, *Some Types*, p. 252 f.

[7] v. Mekh. 74 A; M.R.S. b.J., 67. 116; Torath Kohanim 84 A; Tosefta B.K. 358; M. R. S. b. J. r. שמטילות כפרה בין ישראל.

[8] Tosefta 234; Pal. Hag. 77 A. [9] Esther r. 1. 9.

[10] b. Taanith 19 B.

[11] *Antt.* 14. 2, 1; v. Büchler, *Some Types*, p. 199.

[12] v. Mekh. 33 B; Men. 53 A.

and confiscations, of increasing arrogance and decreasing honour. *R. Eliezer, the Great,* reflecting on the sad changes in the inner life of the scholars and people, concludes with the words: על מי יש לנו להשען על אבינו שבשמים 'In whom can we trust? In our Father in Heaven'.[13] *R. Joshua b. Hananja* depicts Amalek endeavouring to hurt Israel 'from under the wing of their Father in Heaven'.[14] *R. Eleazar b. Azarja* teaches: 'A man must not say, "I will not do this or that prohibited by the law, because I have no desire to do so," but he should say, "I would like to do so, eat this, but what can I do? *My Father in Heaven* decreed upon me not to do it or eat it!"'[15] *R. Ishmael,* speaking of the writings and scrolls of the heretics, says: ומה לעשות שלום בין איש לאשתו אמרה תורה שמי שנכתב בקדושה ימחה על המים הללו שמטילים קנאה ואיבה ותחתרות בין ישראל לאביהם שבשמים ע'א כו"כ. 'And if in order to make peace between husband and wife the Torah did allow the Name written in holiness to be blotted out by water, how much more these books which stir up enmity, envy, and strife between Israel and their Father in Heaven'.[16] R. Ishmael follows here the teaching on peace expressed by R. Johanan b. Zakkai (v. above, p. 57). The same sentence is reported in a Haggadic legend taught by R. Hisda in the name of Ahitophel ומה לעשות שלום בין איש לאשתו אמרה תורה שמי שנכתב בקדושה ימחה על המים לעשות שלום לכל העולם כולו על אחת כמה וכמה.[17] Attention may be drawn to the differences between the two sayings. Ahitophel speaks of peace between the

[13] M. Sotah, 49 B. R. Eliezer concludes his prayer on behalf of R. Jose b. Durmaskis with יהי רצון מלפני אבינו שבשמים שיחזרו עיני יוסף למקומן, v. M. Ps. 25. 13, ed. B. p. 214, cf. Yadaim 4. 3; Tosefta Yadaim, ch. 2, Hag. 3 B. M. Ps. 94. 2, ed. B., p. 418 preserved a saying of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, which is omitted in the original sources of Mekhilta and Sifre, reading: ומי גרם לכם לרצות לאביכם שבשמים? הוי אומר יסורין. Suffering brings peace between man and his heavenly Father.

[14] Mech. 56 A; v. the reading in M. R. S. b. J. 84: מחחת כנפי השמים.

[15] Torath Kohanim, 82 B.

[16] Boraita Shabbath, 116 A; Tosefta, 129

[17] b. Sukka, 53 B; b. Maccoth, 11 A.

Father in Heaven and the whole world, whilst R. Ishmael refers to the same between God and Israel. In the legend the whole world is threatened with the flood of waters, whilst R. Ishmael refers to a ceremony limited to Israelites.[18] *R. Akiba's* prayer, 'Our Father, our King, we have no other king besides Thee! Our Father, our King, have mercy upon us for Thine own sake, and let rain come down', is well known.[19] He combines here the two ideas of God's Fatherhood and Kingship. In a second homily, presumably delivered on the Day of Atonement, he says: 'Happy are ye Israelites! Before whom are ye purifying yourselves? Who purifies you? Your Father in Heaven!'[20] He is comforting the old generation that saw the Temple with its sacrificial ceremonies and despaired of atonement. He is also admonishing the new generation that is seeking for means of atonement in new doctrines and conceptions. God, and not sacrifices; God, and not priests or magicians, is purifying and atoning Israel. Speaking of Moses, R. Akiba says: 'He was worthy to become an intermediary between Israel and their Father in Heaven.'[21]

The teachers of the period after Bar-Kokhba discussed, from some cogent reason, the relations between God and Israel, the children to their father, as will be seen from a further chapter devoted to this aspect of the Old Rabbinic doctrine of God. The name 'Father in Heaven' is also very frequent in this age. We refer first of all to *R. Simon b. Johai*, who asks: 'Why did the Manna not descend once a year (sc. and supply them with food)? In order that Israel should turn their heart to their Father in Heaven.'[22] R. Simon b. Menasja expounding Prov. 23. 15, says: 'My son, if thine heart be wise, mine heart shall rejoice, even mine.' This means to say that not only the earthly, but also the heavenly Father rejoices at the student's or scholar's

[18] v. variants of Ishmael's saying, Sifre Num., § 16; b. Ned. 61 B, and Hullin 141 A.

[19] b. Taan. 25 B. [20] M. Yoma 85 B. [21] Tor. Koh. 110 B.

[22] Sifre Num., § 89; cf. Yoma 46 B; cf. also Sifre, Deut. 84 B.

success in wisdom and learning.[23] *R. Phinehas b. Jair* concludes his lament at, or over, the conditions prevailing after the destruction of the Temple, with the same words used by R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos.[24] *R. Eliezer b. Jose* varies the older saying of R. Johanan b. Zakkai, who saw in the altar the peacemaker between Israel and their Father in Heaven. Our teacher puts charity and loving-kindness in the place of sacrifices.[25] *R. Simon b. Eleazar* sees in the word שעטנז (Lev. 19. 19, Deut. 22. 11) the idea that he who wears a cloth or a garment of mixed kinds turns away from God, and causes his Father in Heaven to turn away from him.[26] *R. Nathan* reflects upon the persecutions of the Jews in his days. Jews are crucified, killed, put to death in the most cruel ways. Why? Because of their observances of Sabbath, circumcision, &c. All these punishments, says Israel, cause to make me beloved to my Father in Heaven.[27] *Judah ben Temah* says: 'Be bold as a leopard and light as an eagle and swift as a gazelle and strong as a lion to do the will of thy Father which is in Heaven.'[28] Owing to the religious persecutions in the second half of the second century, depicted by R. Nathan, all one's boldness, strength, and swiftness were required in order to do the will of God.

The sayings of the Amoraic Haggadists offer abundant instances of the familiar use of this name in the third and fourth centuries. Here again a few instances shall suffice. *R. Johanan b. Nappaha* concludes one of his homilies with

[23] Sifre Deut., § 48, reads R. Simon b. Johai; the correct reading is preserved in Yalkut, Midr. Tannaim, 43; Yalkut Makhiri; Prov. 23. 13; and Gen. r. ch. 63, ed. Th., p. 678, where, as usual, הקב׳ה is read instead of אביו שבשמים.

[24] v. above, p. 58.

[25] v. the references, Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits*, p. 61, note 100. We have, perhaps, to read שלום גדול [ועושה] פרקליט גדול instead of ושלום גדול?

[26] Sifre Deut., § 232; Torath Kohanim 78 B; M. Kel. 9. 8; Tos. Kelaim; 9. 8.

[27] Mekh. 68 B; M. Ps. 110.

[28] Aboth v. 23; v. Num. r. 20. 24; Tanh. iv. 148 לעשות רצון קונו; v. ib., 4. 21; A. b. R. N. i. 41, ii. 48; b. Pes. 112 A.

a peroration explaining Jer. 3. 19: 'What is the business of a father? He loves his son. What is the son's business? He is longing for the delights of his father, who feeds him. Likewise ye Israelites shall be longing after your Father in Heaven.'[29] *R. Jose b. Hanina* explains the name Simon, שומע בקול אביו שבשמים, 'he who hearkens to the voice of his Father in Heaven'.[30] *R. Jose b. Jeremiah* raises the question: 'Wherefore are the prophets of Israel compared to women?' (e. g. היפה בנשים, Cant. 1. 8). 'To tell thee that just as a woman is not ashamed to ask for the needs of the house (לתבוע צרכי ביתה), similarly are the prophets proud to ask for Israel's need from their Father in Heaven.'[31] *R. Menahem b. Abin* explains the names in 1 Chron. 4. 22. אשר בעלו למואב is interpreted by 'his pleasant deeds came and ascended before his Father in Heaven'.[32] *R. Huna* interprets Cant. 2. 2: 'Israel is like the lily, for even if they are tortured by taxes and duties (ארנוניות and בורסגניות) their heart is turned to their Father in Heaven.'[33] *R Levi* uses the name פטרון בשמים instead of אב שבשמים.[34] There can be cited also a goodly number of passages from the anonymous Haggada, which show what we think by now to have demonstrated, viz., the great popularity of this divine name. For our present purpose this may suffice.

(3) אב לכל העולם

'Father of the whole world.' In Midrash Prov. 10. 1 we read: אין אב אלא הקב"ה שהוא אב לכל העולם שנ' אבי יתומים.[35] 'Father is the Holy One, blessed be He, for He is the Father of the whole world', cf. Ps. 68. 6. The sentence אין אב אלא הקב"ה occurs in a saying of R. Hanina b. Papa.[36] Further,

[29] Tanh. iv. 82. [30] Gen. r. 71. 4.

[31] Pes. B. 101 A; M. Prov., ch. 31; Cant. r. to 1. 7.

[32] Ruth r. 2. 4; v. also ib., 2. 1. ושבאתה ונדבקה בישראל ועלו מעשיה לאביה שבשמים

[33] Cant. r. 2. 2. [34] Tanh. iii. 95; Pes. B. 79 A; M. Ps. 26.

[35] M. Prov., ed. Stettin, 13 A.

[36] b. Ber. 35 B: כל הנהנה מן העוהז בלא ברכה כאילו גוזל להקב"ה וכנסת ישראל, based on Prov. 28. 24, where Father = God, mother = the com-

in an anonymous homily based on a Boraita,[37] which describes the five duties of a father to his son. The preacher extends these to God also, by saying האב זה הקב"ה.[38]

(4) אדון

'Lord': v. also מרי and רבון in Aramaic. We find this name combined with אדון העולם 'Lord of the world', אדון העולמים 'Lord of the worlds', or כל העולמים 'of all the worlds', אדון לכל המעשים 'Lord of all the works'[38a], אדון כל הבריות 'Lord of all the creatures',[39] אדון לכל באי העולם 'Lord of all who come into the world'. R. Simon b. Johai observed that Abraham was the first to call God אדון 'Lord' (cf. Gen. 15. 2).[40] R. Aha contradicts or ignores this earlier teaching. He taught that Adam was the first to call God אדון 'Lord'.[41] This teacher makes Adam say: 'Thou art worthy to be called "Lord" for Thou really art Lord of all Thy creatures, and Lord of all the worlds.'[42] The Tannaitic Midrash uses the term אדון לכל באי עולם,[43] which is identical with אדון כל הבריות. The old Tannaitic Haggada altogether prefers the term כל באי עולם to כל בריות. R. Hijja the Great[44] follows R. Simon b. Johai

munity of Israel, and חבר לאיש משחית = Jeroboam b. Nebath, who led astray Israel from their Father in Heaven.

[37] Quoted j. Kid. 61 A; b. Kid. 29 A; Tosefta Kid., ch. 2; Mekhilta, Eccles. r. 9. 9; and Num. r. 17. 1.

[38] Tanh. iv. 71. [38a] Ben Azzai, Tr. Derek Erets, ch. 4.

[39] In a homily on Deut. 3. 23 we read: ואתחנן במיני תחנונים, בעת ההיא לאמר, שאין תל לאמר אלא א"ל הודיעני אם אני נכנס לארץ ואם לאו אדון, אדון לכל באי העולם, אלהים בדין בראת את העולם, v. Sifre Num., § 134.

[40] b. Ber. 7 B. R. Johanan in his name, and the remark of Rab about Daniel; v. also Agadath Bereshit, B. 112: שהוא עשה הקב"ה אדון כל בריותיו; v. also אדון כל הבריות; Sifre, Deut. 31; Mak. 102 A; Exod. r. 29; Ruth r. beg.

[41] Gen. r. 17. 4; M. Ps. 8. 2 B, p. 74; Pes. B. 34 A; Pes. r. 34 A; Eccles. r. 7. 23; Marmorstein, Midrash Abkhir, Dwir i. 131 and 136; and Tanh. iv. 111.

[42] אדון לכל בריותיך ואדון כל העולמים, v. Midr. Abkhir, p. 131; cf. Midrash Temurah, ed. Wertheimer, 9. הקב"ה אדון לכל דבר.

[43] § 134, ed. Horowitz, 180. [44] הגדול, or רבה.

when he lets Moses ask before God: 'Through me dost Thou want to redeem the children of Abraham, who caused Thee to become Lord of all creatures?'[45] *R. Isaac* speaks of God as אדון כל העולם[46] 'the leader, the Lord of the whole world'. Some explain Ps. 9. 21 (שיתה ה' מורה להם): 'There are some who arrogate to themselves the character of divinity; make known unto them, teach them that Thou art the Lord over all of them.' (אדון על כולם)[47]. Pharaoh called himself 'Lord of the world'.[48] It may be that the preacher refers to the emperor-cult in his days. R. Samuel b. Nahmani explains the name אדון (Isa. 1. 24): 'The Lord who uproots the dwellers of the land and settles others in their place'[49] (cf. Isa. 3. 11). 'God is the Lord of the heavenly (i.e. angels) and the earthly hosts (i.e. Israel).'[50] R. Abbahu explains the names of places in Neh. 7. 61: כרוב אדון ואמר, 'God said: The Lord said, "I thought that Israel will be before me like a cherub, and they became leopards."'[51] An anonymous Haggadist[52] makes Mordecai say to Haman: 'There is a Lord, who is more exalted than all the high ones; how can I leave Him and worship the idols?' Finally we mention a homily combining Exod. 22. 24 ('If thou lend money to any of my people') with Ps. 112. 5 ('A good man sheweth favour and lendeth'). The preacher chose as the subject of his sermon the theme: 'There is no creature who does not owe something to God. Yet God is gracious and merciful, and forgives the earlier debts' (i.e. sins). Then the preacher illustrates the teaching by

[45] Exod. r. 3. 21; v. also 3. 20: אמר משה להקב"ה אתה אדון העולם וכי אתה רוצה שאהיה שלוח הבי לא איש וכו'.

[46] Gen. r. 39. 1; Th. 365, אני הוא המנהיג אדון כל העולם.

[47] Tanh. ii. 31.

[48] Exod. r. 5. 19.

[49] Pes. B. 123 A: אוקר דיורין ומבנים דיורין.

[50] Exod. r. 15. 7.

[51] b. Kid. 70 A: אמר אדון אני אמרתי יהיו ישראל לפני חשובים ככרוב והם שמו עצמם כנמר. Another version reads אמר אדון אע"פ ששמו עצמם כנמר הן חשובים לפני ככרוב.

[52] Esther r. ch. 6: יש אדון המתגאה על כל הגאים ואיך אני מניחו ואשתחוה לע"ז.

a parable. Once a man borrowed money from a דיוסטוסו[53] and forgot to pay. After a time the borrower comes to the lender and says: 'I know that I owe you money The lender says: 'Why didst thou remind me of thine old debt? I have lost sight of it already!' Thus, *the Lord of the world!* The creatures commit sins. He looks with patience, and they do not repent. Yet, when they return to Him and remind Him of their earlier transgressions, God does not remember them.[54] Owing to the unsatisfactory state of our texts[55] we are unable to establish whether אדון העולמים was not the original, instead of אדון העולם. It is quite impossible to assume that the Gnostic doctrine of the Jewish God as the Lord of this world, the Satan, the Demiurgos,[56] the source of Evil, should not have influenced the theological speculations and the apologetical tendencies of the Rabbis. We will show later on that many homilies and teachings are due to this cause.

(5) אדיר

'Mighty.' Four are called 'mighty': e.g. God (Ps. 93. 4, אדיר במרום יי), Israel, Egypt, and the waters. 'The Mighty (God) will come and punish the mighty ones (Egypt) on behalf of the mighty ones (Israel) by means of the waters, which are called mighty.'[57] This saying is ascribed to R. Ezra, the grandson of R. Euptolemaeus, a descendant of R. Eleazar b. Azarja. It is also to be found in the Mekhilta.[58]

(6) אדם

'Man.' R. Judah b. Simon sees in Eccles. 2. 21 (אדם) one of God's names, based on Ezek. 1. 26.[59] This anthropomorphic designation of God is rather striking. We shall have to

[53] A moneylender, read דניסטום, Danista, or *δανειστής*, v. Levy, *H. W. B.*, s. v. and Preuschen-Bauer, loc. cit., col. 266.

[54] Exod. r. 31. 1. [55] v. further, p. 98.

[56] Marcion, Irenaeus i. 24.

[57] Men. 53 A; v. also Midr. Prov., ed. Stettin, 12 A. [58] 41 A.

[59] v. Tanh. i. 24; Gen. r. 27. 1; Eccles. r. 2. 21; Gen. r. also refers to Dan. 8. 16.

consider whether the Haggadist was not influenced by the christological development of the term 'Son of Man'.

(7) אחד

'One.' This name occurs even in the Tannaitic Haggada. R. Ishmael b. Jose says: 'Judge not alone, for there is none save One (God), who judgeth alone.'[60] Some[61] see this name in Dan. 8. 13 (ואשמעה אחד), which means: 'I heard אחד, i.e. God, קדוש, who is called the Holy One by all, מדבר, He decrees hard decrees on his creatures.' R. Abbahu uses the name in his exposition of Deut. 1. 2: אחד עשר יום מחורב במיוחד שבעשרה חטאתם, בשמי שהוא אחד ראש לכל הדברות שנ' אנכי ה'[62] 'Ye have sinned against the chief commandment of the Decalogue, against my name, that is אחד, the first of the Words' (i.e. Commandments). The Scribes may have found this name alluded to in Zech. 14. 9.[63]

(8) איש

'Man.'[64] R. Simon b. Johai saw in Prov. 15. 23 שמחה לאיש (joy to a man), an allusion to God, cf. Exod. 15. 3.[65] R. Joshua b. Levi sees in Gen. 43. 14 לפני האיש the name of God.[66] 'The brethren stood before their heavenly Judge.' Interesting is R. Aha's sermon, who says: 'When Israel went into exile the nations of the world greatly rejoiced[67] that Israelites were driven from their places. It does not say נודי (thou shalt move), but נודו (ye shall move). They (the nations of the world) spoke against God (כלפי מעלה)

[60] Aboth iv. 8; v. Mekh. 33 A; Pappus דן יחידי לכל באי עולם; Pal. Sanh. 11 A, and Marmorstein, 'Some Greek and Rabbinic Ideas of God', loc. cit., p. vi.

[61] Gen. r. 21. 1, ed. Th. 198. [62] Exod. r. 42. 6.

[63] v. Tr. Derekh Erez r. ch. 2: יחיד ושמו אחד ושוכן בשבעה הרקיעים, v. also Sifra 74 B as to Mal. 2. 15.

[64] v. Marmorstein, '*Some Remarks on the Slavonic Josephus*' in the *Quest.*, 17 (1926), 3.

[65] Gen. r. 19, ed. Theodor; v. also Gen. r. 3. 3. [66] Gen. r. 92. 3.

[67] M. Ps. B. 97 reads: היו או"ה אומרים להגלותן ממקומם; v., however, Yalkut Makhiri, 66: היו או"ה שמחים להגלותם ממקומם.

and Israel (כלפי מטה). Like as a bird is moving from its nest, so a man (God) wanders from his place' (Prov. 27. 8).[68] Nahum, the son of Simai,[69] preached in Tarsus on Exod. 12. 3 ויקחו להם איש: 'Take *God* unto you. By performing the duty of sacrificing the Paschal lamb the Israelite draws near to God.'[70] This extraordinary homiletical contribution seems to be directed against Christological conceptions of the Paschal lamb, and it is rather a curious coincidence that it should have been delivered in Paul's native place! We find similar expositions of Biblical verses, which are most instructive instances of the allegorical methods and sermons of the Palestinian preachers. We mention here some of them. On Num. 5. 12 a preacher remarks: 'The faithless woman commits a sin against God (איש של מעלה), and against her husband (איש של מטה).[71] Others apply Num. 15. 24 to explain Israel and God's mutual relation. A third preacher combines Num. 11. 16 with Prov. 22. 11. 'Why does the text say שבעים איש and not שבעים אישים? They shall be similar to God and Moses, both of whom are called איש' (v. Exod. 15. 3 and Num. 12. 3).[72] A fourth teacher dwells on Num. 19. 9. ואסף 'God, who gathered the exiles of Israel' (cf. Isa. 11. 12), איש 'God' (cf. Exod. 15. 3), טהור 'God' (cf. Hab. 1. 13), shall gather 'the ashes of the heifer, i.e. the exiles of Israel, and lay them without the camp in a clean place, i.e. Jerusalem.'[73] A fifth preacher saw in נרו לכם איש (1 Sam. 17. 8) 'choose unto you a man', i.e. God.[74] Further, we find that Isa. 2. 9; וישפל איש, was expounded as the

[68] '*A man*' means God, 'from His place' = his sanctuary. They meant to say that God ceased to rule and exist.

[69] Pes. B. 55 B. R. Berekhja in the name of R. Abbahu, whose relations to Christians in Caesarea are well proved, דדש נחום בשם ר' סימאי, Yalk. נחום איש בית אבין, MS. Oxf. and Pes. r. ברכיה בש"ר אבהו דריש ר' נחום ב"ר סימאי בטריסים.

[70] Tanh. iv. 30; Num. r. 9. 1.

[71] Num. r. 9. 54: והביא האיש זה הקב"ה את אשתו זו כנסת ישראל.

[72] Tanh. iv. 60: איש שהם דומין לי ולך.

[73] Tanh. iv. 120; Pes. B. 44 B.

[74] Tanh. iii. 49, anonym.; b. Sotah, 42 B; R. Johanan.

humiliation of God by the sins of His creatures.[75] As a characteristic instance shall be quoted a homily on Exod. 21. 7, where איש 'the man is God', בתו 'his daughter', the Torah, לאמה 'to Israel'.[76] All these and other[77] homilies are based on Exod. 15. 3. The old Tannaites asked already: 'Is it possible to speak thus of God? Behold, the Heavens and the earth do I fill, saith the Lord' (Jer. 23. 24, cf. Isa. 6. 3, 2 Chron. 6. 18, and Ezek. 43. 2). Owing to His love of Israel, Israel's holiness, does God sanctify His name through Israel, as it is said: 'For I am God, and not man' (Hos. 11. 9).[78] We have plenty of evidence at our disposal to prove that this Midrash belongs to the school of R. Ishmael, who were averse to anthropomorphic explanations of R. Akiba's method, and consequently objected to and opposed the identification of איש with God.

(9) אלהים

'God.' It is a well-established fact that the name Elohim was not used in the schools and synagogues of the first four centuries in Palestine except in quotations from the Bible, in prayers, and magic. This innovation has to be regarded as one of the most important intellectual movements in old Israel. We do not know by whom or when this reform was introduced. The history of this alteration is shrouded in antiquity and carries with it important consequences, for such a change must be regarded as highly momentous in the development of religious thought in antiquity. One of the most remarkable days in the history of Israel was that moment in the life of the Jews when it dawned even on the minds of the broad masses, that the God who spoke to them through Moses and the

[75] b. Sotah 48 A: וישפל איש שנורמין שפלות לשונאו של הקב"ה ואין איש אלא הקב"ה. R. Johanan sees in איש, Zech. 1. 8, the divine name, and Ulla, in Prov. 7. 19, 'the man is not in his house' = God, after the destruction of the Temple.

[76] Midrash quoted in כד הקמח, 3 A; cf. Exod. r. 30.

[77] v. further Cant. r. 1. 14, s. v. אשכול הכופר.

[78] Mekhilta 38 A.

Prophets, who admonished them through the Scribes and teachers, who appealed to them through the word of the Torah and the symbols of the observances, was different from the deities of Egypt and Babylonia, Greece and Rome, of the philosophers and astrologers. Therefore the term אלהים was no longer sufficient to express their religious needs and requirements. No longer did it convey the higher, purer, and clearer idea of God, which became more and more the religious view of the whole people. We have already seen that the Scribes fought for the retention of the Tetragrammaton in spite of the opposition of the Hellenists and the conservative instincts of the Sadducees. Whether the alteration of the name אלהים gave rise to a spiritual struggle in an opposite direction, where the combatants changed places, is not known to us. Examining closely our literary documents, it may be that we must come to the conclusion that the Scribes and preachers did not use the name אלהים, אל unless they quoted a passage from the Scriptures, or spoke Aramaic. They used it in reference to the idols, or in speeches of heathens, and in dialogues with sectarians and strangers. Even some of the usages of אלהים in the Bible were considered profane when applied to idols, to judges, and to mortals. No wonder that the attempts of scholars and the feeling of the common people, owing to the ambiguity of the term, showed necessary caution in their mode of expression and favoured the elimination of the term 'Elohim'. Yet it was retained together with the Tetragrammaton in prayers, or in oaths without, and with Israel אלהי ישראל (v. no. 11) in exorcism.

The rich material at our disposal requires us to treat these different aspects individually and point out their various significances.

(*a*) אלהים *or* אלוהות *for Idols.*

R. Akiba explains the את in Gen. 1. 1 by saying to R. Ishmael: 'If it read בראשית ברא שמים, one would assume

that heaven and earth are gods!'[79] R. Hoshaja: 'Where is there a nation whose Godhead agrees with her?'[80] R. Hama b. Hanina speaks of God's foreknowledge that the heathen would worship the sun and moon and planets, and make them gods.[81] R. Samuel b. Nahmani depicts the future judgement, when God will call the nations with their gods (ואלהיה עמה) to be judged.[82] R. Levi makes Pharaoh produce דיפתרא של אלוהות, the scrolls of parchment on which the lists of gods were written.[83] An old Midrash knows of four applications of the term אלהים. First for God, secondly for the idols, thirdly for Israel, and fourthly for angels.[84] In the time of the Scribe, just as in the period of the Holy Writings, the name Elohim was still in vogue among the heathen. Some indication as to the movement aroused by our problem may be gathered from the old discussions on the name אלהים attached to the strange deities (Exod. 20. 3). These discussions, as will be shown later on, began in the first century C.E., if not earlier, and were continued till the third century. The questions and objections on this ground may have led to the avoidance of the name altogether.

(*b*) *The Name in the Dialogues.*

In the numerous dialogues between heathens and scribes the former speak of God as אלהיכם. In some sources, from custom or set purpose, as will be proved in the next chapter, הקב"ה is put for אלהים. We mention here R. Gamaliel II, R. Joshua b. Hananja, R. Akiba, and R. Jose b. Halafta, with various men and women, where our texts

[79] Gen. r., ed. Th., 12; v. also Tanh. i. 6 and parall.

[80] איזה אומה שמסכים אלהיה עמה, v. M. Ps. B. 43. God consents to Israel's arrangements; not so the idols.

[81] ישאו"ה העולם עתידין לעשותן אלוהות, Gen. r. Th. 40; v. also Th. 70, Tanh. ii. 23-4, a similar saying about the assumed divinity of Nebuchadnezzar, Hiram, &c.

[82] M. Ps. B. 229; v. also B 21 and parall.

[83] Tanh. ii. 19, and parall.

[84] Marmorstein: מדרש חסירות ויתירות, London, 1917, p. 59, note 263, where parallels are to be found.

generally read, 'Your God', &c. (אלהיכם). When heathen, like Ahasuerus, Alexander, Titus, &c., speak of Jews and their God, they use the term אלוהיהון דיהודיא. Even Jews speaking in Aramaic use אלוה or אלהיא. Very interesting are R. Levi's proverbs in which this word occurs.

(c) *The Name* אלהים *referred to Mortals.*

We saw that angels are designated by this term. It is applied to Israel generally, further to the judges and some prominent individuals, like Adam, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, &c. No wonder that owing to the manifold meaning of the word some doubts arose in exegesis and Massorah as to the sanctity of the word in many places of the Scriptures.

(d) *The Use of the Name in Oaths and Prayers.*

Many instances can be shown where האלהים is used in exclamations of oath.[85] In prayers it was connected with the Tetragrammaton, e.g. יי אלהינו. A recent writer, Dr. Finkelstein, on the '*Development of the Amidah*',[86] states: 'It will be found that the contemporaries of R. Gamaliel II *never* used the term ה' אלהינו in their prayers, while the Rabbis of the following generation always used it.' A careful investigation of our material does by no means justify such an assertion, and refutes the far-reaching theories based on it. We refer first of all to R. Dosa b. Hyrkanos, who says: העובר לפני התיבה ביום טוב הראשון של ר"ה אומר החליצנו יי אלהינו את יום ר"ח הזה וכו'.[87] R. Johanan b. Zakkai arose and kissed R. Eleazar b. Arakh, saying: ברוך יי אלהי ישראל שנתן בן לא"א.[88] In the Temple they said: ברוך יי אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם.[89] The Tetragrammaton was used in the Temple, even in greetings. The High-Priest, Ishmael b. Elisha, who ministered in the Temple, says: פעם אחת נכנסתי להקטיר קטרת לפני ולפנים וראיתי אכתריאל

[85] v. Marmorstein, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, ii. 69, note 2.
[86] *JQR.*, N. S., xvi., 1925, 1 ff. [87] M. Erubin iii. 9.
[88] Tos. Hag. ii. 1, p. 234. 2 and parall. [89] Ib., i. 11.

יה ה׳ צבאות (b. Ber. 7 A). R. Eleazar b. Zadok reports that his father used to pray on the eve of Sabbath: נחת לנו יי and מאהבתך יי אלהינו שאהבת את ישראל עמך וכו׳ אלהינו.[90] Nehunja b. ha Kana used the words, both when he entered and when he left the house of study: יהי רצון מלפניך ה׳ אלהי and מודה אני לפניך ה׳ אלהי respectively.[91] The High Priest also used the introductory words יהי רצון מלפניך ה׳ אלהינו in his prayer on the Day of Atonement (v. Tanh. iii. 59, and paralls.). All these authorities are either older than, or contemporaneous with, R. Gamaliel II. The whole assumption is based on the omission by the copyists of ה׳ before אלהינו in the story of R. Gamaliel.[92] R. Eleazar b. Zadok quotes a prayer of his father's, and not as we read, *JQR.*, loc. cit., p. 8, note 22, 'The prayer cited by R. Eleazar b. Zadok by his son', which is inaccurate. Ed. Zuckermandel reads: א״ר אלעזר בר צדוק אבא היה וכו׳. R. Eleazar b. Zadok says: 'My father used to pray;' i. e. R. Zadok, since the father used the words ה׳ אלהינו, the son surely followed his example, albeit that the words are omitted. The same is the case with the prayer of R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos. There is no real basis for the theory that before R. Akiba, or in the time of R. Gamaliel II the formulary יי אלהינו in prayers may have been unknown. Is it feasible to believe that R. Gamaliel would have used אלהינו without יי, having experienced that אלהים alone gave rise to many misunderstandings and misinterpretations? Comparing this formulary in the ancient documents, *some* of which must be older than R. Akiba, we always, without any exception, meet the formulary: יהי רצון מלפניך יי אלהינו.[93]

[90] Tos. Ber. 3. 7.

[91] b. Ber. 28 B. To the reading of this Mishna, v. H. B. vi. 72, החלוץ ii. 119, קבוצת חכמים, 119.

[92] v. Midr. Tannaim 172.

[93] v. M. Ber. x. 6; Tos. Ber. 7. 2; b. Ber. 14 B, 16 B; b. Shabb. 30 B; Gen. r. 60. 7, 68. 11, 85. 5; b. Taan. 5 B; Tanh. iv. 9–10; S. E. R. 18; v. also Boraita b. Ber. 19 A.

(10) אלהים חיים

'Living God.'[94] In the story of Hillel,[95] we read 'in order to hear the words of the living God out of the mouth of Shemaja and Abtaljon'. R. Abba says in the name of Samuel: 'Three years lasted the dispute between the houses of Shammai and Hillel. Each of them insisting on their opinion, till a בת קול was heard, saying: "Both are the words of the living God."'[96] R. Matja b. Heresh says to R. Josiah: מה לך לעזוב דברי אלהים חיים, 'Wherefore dost thou forsake the words of the living God?'[97] A Boraita mentions God (cf. Jer. 10. 10) among the ten things that are called חיים.[98]

(11) אלהי ישראל

'The God of Israel.' This name appears mostly in exorcism and magic. A few instances must suffice. The Greeks compelled the Jews to write on the horn of the ox that they have no share in the God of Israel.[99] Vows are given to the God of Israel.[100] R. Johanan b. Nappaha promises by oath אשתבע לאלהא דישראל that he will not reveal a secret.[1] In the confession we say: 'I sinned against the God of Israel.'[2] In excommunication R. Hisda says: ליהוי בשמתא דאלהי ישראל.[3] Finally we find the term in introductions to sermons by the preachers.[4]

(12) אלופו של עולם

'The friend of the world.' The teachers of the Midrash saw in Prov. 16. 28 an allegory of the story of Eve and the serpent. The froward man (איש תהפוכות), i. e. the serpent. 'Why?' 'Because he turned his words against his Creator'

[94] v. Dan. 6. 27, אלהא חיה.
[95] b. Yoma 35.
[96] b. Erubin, 13 B; cf. b. Gittin, 6 B; Sotah 3. 4, ת"ר, a Boraita.
[97] Aboth R. N. i, ch. 1, p. 1.
[98] Ib. i. 34; Sch. 103.
[99] v. above, p. 35, note 55.
[100] Ned. 8 A, 22 B; R. Asi.
[1] Yoma, 84 A; A. Z. 28 A.
[2] Yoma, 86 A.
[3] b. Hullin, 133 B; v. also Hekhalot in Jellinek's בית המדרש, iii. 84; *Testament of Naphtali in Hebrew*, ed. Wertheimer, בתי מדרשות, 2. 14; Sota, 8. 3.
[4] v. A. b. R. N. i. 3, p. 17; Jeb. 121 A.

(בוראו). 'He is the whisperer, because he whispered words against his Creator. Thus did he divide them from the chief Friend of the world.'[5] R. Judah, the Meturgeman of R. Simon b. Lakish, explained Micah 7. 5: 'If the evil inclination told thee, "Go, sin, God is forgiving!" do not trust him, for it is said, "Do ye not trust the Evil One", and the יצר הרע is the evil [cf. Gen. r. 8. 21], nor do ye trust a Friend (אלוף)! (i.e. God [cf. Jer. 3. 4], scil. God will not forgive him).'[6]

(13) אמת

'Truth.' [v. אותיות דר'ע, ed. Wertheimer, p. 1; Or Zarua i. 5 A; Maimonides, מאמר הייחוד, ed. Steinschneider, p. 32, note 17].

(14) אני

'I.' Some see this name in Hillel's saying: אם אני כאן [Aboth i. 14] and in the exclamation at the festival of water drawing (b. Sukka 45 A, 53 A).

(15) בודק לבבות

'Searcher of Hearts.' R. Berekhja uses this term in reply of God to Esau (Gen. r. 67. 8): לית את ידע די אנא בודקיהון דלבביא, 'Dost thou not know that I am the searcher of Hearts?'

We have also חוקר לבבות (cf. Jer. 17.10) and בוחן כליות ולבבות. The first occurs in a speech of Abraham before God: 'A man tests his friend, for he does not know what is in the heart of his friend. Thou, however, who art *the Searcher of hearts and reins,* dost Thou need this? Was it not revealed before Thee, when Thou saidst that I shall sacrifice my son then I will surely be eager to slaughter him with a willing heart?'[7] The second is frequently used in the Seder Elijahu[8] and in the later Haggada.[9]

[5] Gen. r. 182.
[6] b. Hag. 16 A and parall.
[7] Tanh. i. 114.
[8] v. pp. 30, 44, 48, 126.
[9] v., for instance, Exod. r. 11. 2.

(16) בורא

'Creator.' One of the most usual names of God. The Tannaitic Haggada knows this term in the sayings of R. Judah b. Ilai,[10] R. Simon b. Jochai,[11] and R. Judah I.[12] More frequent is the term in the sentences of the Amoraim. We begin with R. Joshua b. Levi. Jacob said: מה אנא מובד סברי סברי מן בריי ח'ו לית אנא מובד סברי מן בריי אלא עזרי מעם יי 'Why do I lose my hope in my Creator? Far be it from me to do so; my help is from God!'[13] R. Johanan bar Nappaha, R. Hanina b. Hama, and R. Simon b. Lakish dispute at what age Abraham recognized God, his Creator.[14] R. Isaac b. Merjon adds to Gen. 2. 4, 'Their *Creator* praises them; who can reprove them? Their Creator glorifies them; who can find fault with them?'[15] The saying is surely directed against Gnostics,

[10] M. Ps. 399: ולכך היה מכוין לבוראו, derived from Gen. 28. 11: ויקח מאבני המקום; v. Gen. r. 68. 11, where this sentence is omitted; Pirke, R. El., ch. 35.

[11] M. Ps. 172; Lev. r. 5. 8: תני ר'שב'י כמה גבורים הם הם הצדיקים שהם יודעים לפתות את בוראם ויודעין היאך לקלם. A similar saying by R. Josiah; M. Ps. 366 f., Gen. r. 29. 4, Pes. B. 152 A: שיודעים לפתות את בוראם בתרועה ובקול שופר; some MSS. read הקב'ה instead of בוראם.

[12] Tanh. i. 215: קברו אותי בכלים לבנים שלא אבוש במעשי להקביל פני בוראי, v. Gen. r. 97, Gen. r. 100. 2, jer. Kel. 32 B, Ket. 35 A. R. Josiah, instead of R. Judah; v. also the saying of Jose משיתא, Gen. r. 65. 18 לא הוה לך להרגין ווי אוי אוי שהבעסתי לבוראי, Tanh. iii. 82; R. Nathan בוראך, Tanh. iv. 165 להכעיס את בוראי, ib., 167 לעשות רצון בוראי; M. Sam. 120 להרגין על בוראי.

[13] Gen. r. 68. 2; v. also p. 556. Anonymous, Sarah says: מה אנא מובדה סברי מן בריי חס ושלום לית אנא מובדה סברי מן בריי אלא אני ביי אעלוזה; v. also R. Abba b. Kahana, M. Sam. איה דסברינין פסיק, R. Jonathan b. Eliezer, Gen. r. 61 למד מבוראך שברא, Tanh. i. 190 צדיקים בטוחים על בוראם 'The righteous trust in their Creator' (R. Hijja b. Abba), Tanh. i. 163, R. Hanina b. Isaac אשרין לילוד אשה שכך שמע מבוראו ראו כל מה שתבע מבוראו הבטיחו.

[14] Gen. r. 30. 8, 64. 64: ר' יוחנן ור' חנינא תרוייהון אמרין בן מ"ח שנה הכיר אברהם את בוראו; R. J. b. L. says: ג' שנים הכיר אברהם את בוראו, Tanh. i. 119, and Gen. r. 95. 2.

[15] Gen. r. 138; v. also, p. 99: בוראן משבחן ומי מגנן בוראן מקלסן ומי יתן בהם דופי.

who found fault with and criticized the creation of God. R. Eleazar explains Gen. 4. 16: ויצא קין מלפני ה׳ 'and Cain went from before God', כמפרים ומרמא בבוראו 'as one who cheated and deceived God'.[16] R. Levi accuses the serpent of having slandered God.[17] He found further Akabja b. Mehalalel's famous saying[18] indicated in Eccles. 12. 1: 'Remember thy Creator, i.e. God.' R. Phinehas b. Hama says of Eve: 'She added to God's commandment, and was ready to fulfil her Creator's will.'[19] Further, to Gen. 49. 2, ושמעו אל ישראל, he says: 'Your father Israel is (like) God! As God is a Creator of worlds, so Israel created worlds.'[20] R. Berekhja makes all the trees of the garden talk to Adam, saying: 'Lo, the thief, he has stolen the mind of his Creator; he has stolen the mind of his Lord!'[21] Very often in anonymous homilies.[22] In a sermon based on Job 4. 17: 'Can a human being be more just than his Creator? Can he be purer than his Creator.'[23] 'The just are like their Creator.'[24] Abraham preaches to his contemporaries: 'What do ye want of God, who sits high above? Did He say to you, "Go, trouble, and supply Me with food?" Behold, He is the Creator; He is supplying you!'[25] David says: 'God, too, gives evidence on

[16] Gen. r. 202, Pes. 160 A, Lev. r. 10. 4 read Eleazar bar Simon. The chronology does not fit in M. Ps. 100. 2, Tanh. i. (בראשית) 25.

[17] Gen. r. 172: התחיל אומר דילטוריה לבוראו; M. Ps. 10: הנחש אמר לשון הרע על בוראו; Tanh. iii. 47; Exod. r. 3. 14.

[18] Aboth iii. 1; j. Sota, 18 A; Lev. r. 18; Eccles. 12. 1; Lam. r. 17.

[19] Gen. r. 38 f.

[20] Gen. r. 98. 4 to בורא עולמות; v. also R. Abbahu, Gen. r. 9. 2, and R. Tanhuma, Eccles. r. 3. 11, M. Ps. 244, Gen. r. 3. 7.

[21] Gen. r. 140; v. Ps. 36. 12: רגל שנתגאה על בוראה = רגל גאוה, 177, only הא גנבא דגנב דעתיה דבריה, Pes. B. 142 B.

[22] v. above, sub אלופו של עולם, sub no. 12.

[23] Gen. r. 555, Pes. B. 123 B, M. Sam. 98: שאול אל תהי צדיק יותר מבוראך.

[24] Gen. r. 67. 7; R. Eleazar b. Jose; v. also Tanh. i. 31, 'Noah was called just because he supplied food to God's creatures; therefore he became like his Creator' (נעשה כבוראו). Ib., i. 132, 'Jacob was a partner with his Creator in everything' (שותף עם בוראו). The wicked, however, לא היה לבם שוה לבוראם, M. Ps. 427.

[25] Tanh. i. 99.

my behalf, and says, "The Lord has chosen for Him a man according to His heart (1 Sam. 13. 14)"; he (David) put his name together with that of his Creator' (וכינה שמו לבוראו).[26] David says: 'Stir up my honour before the honour of my Creator; my honour is nothing before the honour of my Creator.'[27] 'Our duty is to praise and magnify our Creator.'[28] There is a dialogue between God and Jeremiah. God: 'If thou descendest with (Israel) to Babylon, I remain here; or if thou remainest here, I go with them to Babylon.' Jeremiah: 'If I went with them, what good can I be to them? Let their Creator (ברייהו) go with them, and He will help them!'[29] Three times did the nations of the world rejoice, and said: 'Now can Israel dispute with their Creator?'[30] Finally, we notice that even heathens used this term in speaking of God.[31] R. Johanan sat before the Babylonian synagogue of Sepphoris and preached there. An official (ארכונא) passed and the scribe did not rise before him. The slaves of the Archon wanted to punish R. Johanan, but their master commanded them: 'Leave him alone, he is engaged with the Law of his Creator!'[32]

(17) בחור

'The Chosen One.'[33]

[26] M. Ps. 4.

[27] M. Ps. 184, 298; Pal. Ber. (8. 1) 2 D; Lam. r. 2. 22 (p. 120); Ruth r. 6. 1; Pes. B. 63 A: אין כבודי כלום לפני כבוד בוראי; v. also Bloch in H. Cohen, *Judaica*, 165.

[28] M. Ps. 381. The relation between God and world.

[29] Pes. B. 113 A; Lam. r., Intr., p. 34.

[30] Pes. B. 76 B; R. Samuel b. Nahmani, Cant. חכו ממתקים; Num. r. 10. 1; Lev. r. 27.

[31] Pal. Ber. 5. 1 דברייה הוא עסיק (*νόμος*) ארפוניה בנימוסיא.

[32] v. further for the use of this term S. E. R. 97. Until that time (Abraham) did not yet recognize his Creator, v. to הביר בוראהו above note 14, and p. 130 חמה ולבנה וכו' כולם משבימים ומעריבים לעשות רצון בוראם, and Pirke R. E. 51 והקשה הירח את ערפו לעשות רצון בוראו. In this work we find the term about six times, cf. chaps. 11 (three times), 13, 21, 27, 48 (twice) לשם בוראו.

[33] Tanh. iii. 74; v. Gen. r. ch. 8: 'An earthly king does not allow others to wear his titles, e. g. Augustus, God calls Israel אלהים', Ps. 82. 6; חכם

(18) בעל הבית

'The Master of the House.' Simon b. Zoma, when beholding the crowds in Jerusalem, used to say: 'Blessed be He who created all these in order to serve me!' Likewise he used to point out the difference between a good and a bad guest. The latter does not thank the Lord of the House, the former is grateful for every gift, every trouble, and every service offered him. There can be no doubt that Ben Zoma meant under the good guests the faithful, and under the bad guests the Gnostics, who found faults and blasphemed the Lord of the House, i.e. God.'[34] R. Tarphon in his famous saying of the shortness of the day, the greatness of the task, the sluggish workmen and the urging master of the house,[35] saw in the master of the house none else but God. The master of the house, like the king, is a most popular figure in the Haggada, just as in the parables of the Stoics,[36] and in that of the Gospels.[37] Some of these contribute a good deal to our knowledge of the Rabbinic conception of the divinity, and, therefore, must be dealt with here. 'The master of the house has two cows; one is strong, the other is weak. Upon which does he put the yoke? On the former. God, the בעל הבית, tests the righteous, the strong ones.'[38] R. Aha[39] illustrates the idol worshippers by the simile of התושב מפנה לבעל הבית 'the stranger (the idols) remove the master of the house' (God). R. Helbo depicts the relation of God to Israel in the parable of the orphan and the בעל הבית. The orphan was brought up and supplied with

Deut. 4. 7, and God is also called by the same name, Job 9. 4; דודים or דוד, cf. Cant. 5. 10, 5. 1: בחור = ib. 15 and Deut. 7. 6, 7 and חסיד, Jer. 3. 12, Ps. 50. 5, קדוש Is. 6. 3, Lev. 19. 2.

[34] Pal. Ber. ix. 1; Tosefta Ber. vii. 2, pp. 14–15; B. Ber. 58 A.

[35] Aboth ii. 15.

[36] Epictet iii. 22. 4, 27. 19, the *οἰκοδεσπότης*.

[37] Luke 12. 39, Matt. 13. 27; v. also Theophilus ii. 17; Tert., *De cultu fem.*, ii. 10.

[38] R. Eleazar b. Pedath, Gen. r. 32. 3; Gen. r. 55. 2.

[39] Deut. r. 2. 13, v. also Jelamdenu, Genesis ed. Grünhut 26 B: שגר ותושב אימר לבעל הבית פנה את כלך.

everything by the latter. The same orphan boasted of having deserved all by his work and in lieu of his wages. The master of the house says: 'Truly, all that you enjoyed is for the pail of water you have drawn, for the piece of wood you have hewn, but your real wages are kept by me.' God is the master of the house, Israel the orphan, the goods of this world for the sufferings, but the real reward is kept for the world to come.[40] Another teacher speaks of a master of the house and thieves who were caught drinking wine.[41] The master of the house says: 'May ye enjoy yourselves, but please put the bottles in their right place.' God is the בעל הבית, the brethren of Joseph the thieves; they are commanded to return Joseph to Palestine. R. Levi explains the reason for Israel being compared with wheat, and says: 'God is the master of the house, Moses his steward, Israel is the wheat, which is carefully counted.'[42]

(19) בעל בריתי

'Confederate.'[43]

(20) בעל דין

'Accuser.' R. Eleazar ha Kappar enumerates this too among his seven names of God.[44] We find this name earlier in a saying of R. Eleazar b. Azarja: 'Woe unto us because of the day of judgement! Woe unto us because of the day of rebuke! When Joseph the Just, who was a mere human being, rebuked his brethren, they could not stand his rebuke: God, who is a judge, an accuser, and sits on the Throne of Judgement, and judges each person, how much more shall we not be able to stand before Him?'[45]

[40] Deut. r. 3. 7.

[41] Deut. r. 8. 5.

[42] Pes. r. 32 B and parall. Cant. r. 7. 3; v. also Pes. B. 199 A; M. Ps, pp. 481, 482, 514, and others.

[43] Aboth R. N. i. 17, 66. R. Eliezer: דע לפני מי אתה עמל ומי הוא בעל בריתך.

[44] Aboth iv. 22.

[45] Gen. r. 93. 11: הקב"ה שהוא דיין ובעל דין ויושב על כסא דין ודן כל אחד ואחד ע"א כ"ו שאין כל בשר ודם יכולים לעמוד לפניו; v. Tanh. i. 207. R. Eleazar b. Simon in the name of R. E. b. A. somewhat differently: כשבא הקב"ה להתווכח עם כל אחד ואחד מן הבריות ולומר לו מעשיו כמו שכתוב כי הוא

(21) בעל חוב

Creditor.[46]

(22) בעל מחשבות

'Lord of thoughts, Who knows the thoughts of all.' Judah b. Tabbai, or Simon b. Shetah uses this name when saying אבל היודע ובעל מחשבות הוא יפרע מאותו האיש.[47]

(23) בעל מלאכה

'Employer.' R. Eleazar and R. Tarphon, both use the same term in emphasizing the certainty of the payment of reward.[48]

(24) בעל המשפט

'Lord of Judgement.'[49] God loveth judgement (Ps. 37. 28) because He is called בעל המשפט, cf. Isa. 30. 18. God says: 'I am called בעל המשפט, I try to send my hand forward against Esau, but I cannot do so unless I have rewarded him the small commandment he performed in this world.'[50]

יוצר הרים וכו׳. על אחת כמה וכמה שאין בריה יכולה לעמוד; Tanh. v. 10 on Deut. 3. 26: רב לך בעל דין שלך כבר הוציא עליך גזירה שתמות וכל הבריות כמותך. The בעל דין is not Adam, as Buber thought, note 32, but God!

[46] The Babylonian Amora, Rabbah uses the legal axiom, אין אדם מעיז פניו בפני בעל חובו, v. b Ket. 18 A; B. K. 107 A; B. M. 3 A, 5 A; Gittin 51 B; Shebuot 42 B; which can be and is applied to describe man's relation to God, v. already Seneca, *De benefic.*, v. 21, and Marc. Aurel. 10. He is the worst debtor, who reproaches his creditor.

[47] Mekh. 109 A; v. b. Sanh. 37 B read היודע מחשבות; v. Tosefta Sanh. ch. 8, p. 426, l. 24; Pal. Sanh. iv. 9 also היודע מחשבות; v. J. Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'histoire*, p. 149.

[48] Aboth ii. 14 and 16: שישלם לך שכר פעולתך; v. also vi. 5: ונאמן הוא בעל מלאכתך שישלם לך שכר פעולתך.

[49] Tanh. i. 185.

[50] Tanh. ii. 83.

(25) בעל הנחמות

'Lord of Consolations.' This name is used in the old blessing said in the house of the mourners: 'Our brethren, who are suffering and pained by this sad event, make up your mind concerning this! This is standing (sc. the common lot of man) for ever. It is a path designed since the six days of creation. Many have drunk (*sc.* of this cup), and many shall drink it. The lot of the latter ones is as that of the former. Our brethren, may the Lord of Consolations comfort you. Blessed be He, who comforts the mourners.' [51]

(26) בעל העולם

'Lord of the World',[52] used by Philo [53], and in the Mekhilta,[54] שלא יהיו בזויי העולם אומרין מפני שהוא אלוה ובעל עולם עושה דבריו שלא כדת 'in order that the lowly people should not say, "Because He is the God, the Lord of the world, therefore he acts in all things against law and right".' Surely the Haggadist reproduces here the actual words of contemporary Gnostic teachings.

(27) בעל הפקדון, or פקדונות

'Lord of Pledge, or Pledges.' R. Aha says: 'God is the owner of pledges (with reference to Gen. 21. 1). Amalek deposited bundles of thorns, and He returned him the same. Sarah deposited pious and good deeds, and God returned her the same.' [55]

(28) בעל הרחמים

'Lord of Mercy.' [56] R. Nehemja, the father-in-law of R. Levi, said: לעולם אין בעל הרחמים לוקח נפשות תחלה עד שנפרע מן

[51] v. Ket. 8 B; Judah b. Nahmani, the Meturgeman of R. Simon b. Lakish.

[52] v. also above, sub אדון העולם, or העולמים.

[53] De decal. ii. 189; Geffcken, loc. cit., p. xxvii.

[54] Mekh. R. S. b. J., p. 2.

[55] Gen. r. 53. 5; ed. Theod. 560; M. Sam., ch. 18; Pes. r. 181 A.

[56] v. also above אב הרחמים.

הממון 'The Lord of Mercy does not punish the soul before he punishes man's wealth'.[57]

(29) בעל השבועה

'Lord of Oath.' In a legend[58] we read: 'God says to Moses, "In case Jethro says a word about your oath, tell him the Lord of Oath has already released me from it".'

(30) גבוה

'High.' This term is one of the oldest in Rabbinic theology. In our sources it occurs almost exclusively in the Halakha, and here also in very ancient parts. It seems that in the period of the Tannaim and Amoraim this name or designation was already antiquated. In old texts גבוה is opposed to הדיוט, e. g. M. Kid. i. 6, אמירתו לגבוה כנתינתו להדיוט, or put together like Pal. Peah, i. 3, אחד לגבוה אחד להדיוט. We find it in the language of both schools of Shammai and Hillel.[59] R. Eleazar b. Azarja also uses this term.[60] There are also some instances of the use of this term in the Haggada.[61]

(31) גבהות העולם

'The Height of the World.' Eccles. 12. 5, גם מגבוה יראו (also of the high they shall be afraid) is explained, גם מגבהו

[57] Pes. B. 65 B; Pes. r. ch. 17 מעין גנים, ed. Buber, p. 6; Lev. r. ch. 17; Ruth r., v. Buber's note in Pes. B. 5 B, 71.

[58] Exod. r. 4. 4: אם יאמר לך יתרו כלום מן השבועה אמור לו בעל השבועה התיר אותי מן נדרי לכך וילך משה וכו'.

[59] B. *AZ.* 52 B, 63 A; b. Pes., Peah 1. 3; Nazir 6. 1.

[60] Sifre, § 104: ומה אם גבוה אין אדם רשאי להחרים את כל נכסיו ע"א כו"כ שיהיה אדם חייב להיות חס על נכסיו, 114. The service of God in the Temple is called עבודת גבוה, pal. Sanh. 25 B; R. Zeira. Pal. Nazir 51 A שהחמיר בהדיוט (חרם) לשון גבוה הוא האומר לחרם לא וכו' יותר מבנגבוה.

[61] v. R. Avira, or R. Eleazar b. Sota, 5 A: הוא גבוה ורואה את השפל; Tanh. iii. 72 באותה שעה הקב"ה נעשה גבוה בעולמו; and M. Lam. 19 גבוה של עולם; to Eccles. 12. 5 ומגבוהו של עולם נתירא.

של עולם ממ״ה מתירא 'he was afraid of the highest of the world, the King of all kings.'[62]

(32) גבורה

'Might.' This term is also older than the Tannaitic period, and occurs mostly in sayings of that period. It is generally used to emphasize the doctrine that Moses did not enjoin the commandments of his own authority, but מפי הגבורה 'from the mouth of the all-powerful, Almighty'.[63] The repeated reference to this phrase alludes to grave doubts and scepticism on the part of powerful heretic movements as to the reception of the Law from Sinai. The name is also used in other connexions.[64] In the later Midrashim the term occurs mostly in passages copied from older works.[65]

(33) גדול העולמים

'The Great One of the Worlds.' Gen. 21. 8, משתה גדול, is explained with reference to Deut. 30. 9,[66] by R. Judah b. Simon and R. Jose b. Hananiah as meaning that God was also present. It is difficult to reconcile this Haggada with the doctrine of God's omnipresence. God is everywhere present. It is no wonder that some corrected the text in גדולי עולם 'the great of the world were present at the

[62] v. Eccles. r. 12. 8: גם מגבהו של עולם ממ״ה הק״ב״ה; v. also Midrash, Yalk. Daniel, § 1064, באותה שעה הקב״ה הוא גבוה בעולמו, cf. Tanh. B. iii. 72.

[63] Mekh. 26 A: עדשאמר להם משה מפי הגבורה; ib. 71 A, R. Akiba ואין לא נסעו על פי משה אלא ע״פ הגבורה; 77 B, 54 B דבר שלא יצא מפי הגבורה; S. N. 112, R. Ishmael שנאמר למשה מפי חגבורה; ib. 46 אלא הכל מפי הגבורה; T. K. 3 B, S Deut. 9 ולא מעצמי אני אומר לכם אלא משה ומשה מפי הגבורה.

[64] Mech. 59 B: צא והמלך בגבורה; v. also 60 A; ib. 66 A משה משיב דברים לפני הגבורה; A. R. N. 37 בעיני הגבורה; B. Sota, 37 A R. Meir אושפזיכין לגבורה.

[65] Tanh. i. 196, ii. 63, iv. 35, 41, 42, 91, 163, v 31; M. Lam. 38; Pes. B. 20 A, 36 B, 61 B, 126 A, 166 A; M. Ps. 317, 395, 415; Exod. r. 50. 2; S. E. R. 91, 198; P. R. E. chaps. 5, 16, 41.

[66] Gen. r. ch. 50; ed. Th. 565.

banquet.' Yet the more difficult reading is corroborated by another Haggada. R. Isaac teaches that 'the Great of the Worlds' was present at the funeral of Jacob. Here, in order to obviate a mistake, another old reading (ואית דאמרן) has: כבוד חי עולמים ('the Glory of the Everlasting').[67]

(34) גלגל עינו של עולם

'The Eye of the World.' This term occurs twice in a Midrash[68] of R. Aha, whom we know as very clever in forming names of God; he speaks of the five Kings who fought the Eye of the World, God.

(35) דוד

'Beloved.' When R. Hijja b. Ada died, the nephew of Bar Kappara and R. Simon b. Lakish, delivered funeral addresses based on Cant. 6. 2: 'My Beloved is gone down into his garden, to the beds of spices, to feed in the gardens and to gather lilies'. דודי (my beloved), i.e. God; לגנו, i.e. the world; לערוגת הבשם, i.e. Israel; לרעות בגנים, i.e. the nations of the world, to gather the lilies; i.e. the pious, whom he removes from their midst.[69]

(36) דיין

'Judge.' The term אלהים was identified by R. Simon b. Johai with דיין (judge). Thus he substituted for בני אלהים Gen. 6. 2, בני דיינים, and cursed all those who translated בני אלהים.[70] This is in agreement with R. Simon b. Johai's rule אין אלהים אלא דיין.[71] His teacher, R. Akiba, denies the saying of some of his generation: 'There is neither judgement nor judge', by emphasizing, 'Yes, there is judgement,

[67] Gen. r. ch. 100. 6.

[68] Gen. r. ch. 41; ed. Th. 401: לא באו ליזדווג אלא לתוך גלגל עינו של עולם, and 412.

[69] v. Pal. Ber. 2. 8; Cant. r. on 6. 2; v. also Tanh. iii 74.

[70] Gen. r. ch. 36; Th. 247.

[71] Mekhilta 1 a, *MRSJ.*, p. 6.

and there is a Judge', i.e. God.[72] This conception of God's judgeship is one of the most important aspects of our doctrine, and will be dealt with at length in a following chapter. Here may be repeated the saying of R. Eleazar b. Azarja: 'He is a Judge, and Accuser, who is seated on the Throne of Judgement and judges each person individually'.[73] R. Simon b. Johai says: 'Blessed be the true Judge, before whom is no injustice or respect of person'.[74] The attribute of God's justice, and the doctrine of reward and punishment are closely allied with this name. God as Judge is also the source of moral law, justice, and righteousness.

(37) הוא

'He.' In several sayings God is called הוא 'He', without any other designation or explanation. Hillel has a saying: ולקילוסן הוא צריך, does He require their praise?[74a] R. Meir says: '*He* will perform miracles and mighty deeds, and ye shall stand, keeping silence.'[75] R. Eleazar b. Pedath, in his often-repeated saying: כל מקום שנ' ויי הוא ובית דינו.[76] R. Aha also adopted this name.[77] Pythagoras likewise used the name 'Ipse' for the Godhead, v. Cicero, *De natura deorum*, i, 5, L. Dukes, Or. Ltblatt, 1849, 396.

(38) הימנותא

'Faith.' This term is mentioned very rarely, and it is doubtful whether it was known to Palestinian Jews as well as to Babylonian Jews.[78]

[72] Gen. r. ch. 26; Th. 252, and parall.

[73] Gen. r. 93, end: הוא דיין ובעל דין ויושב על כסא דין ודן כל אחד ואחד; v. above בעל דין.

[74] Sifre Deut., § 304: ברוך דיין אמת שאין עולה ומשוא פנים לפנין.

[74a] pal. Sukka, 5. 4; b. Sukka, 53 A.

[75] Mekh. 29 A: הוא יעשה לכם נסים וגבורות ואתם תהיו עומדין ושותקין; v. also Tanh. iii. 71 הוא נגאל. Mishna, M. K. iii. 5 עליו הוא אומר, Gen. r. 37. 4; Esther r. ch. 1.

[76] Gen. r. 51, p. 533, and parall.

[77] Gen. r. 63, p. 678.

[78] b. Shabbath, 10 B.

(39) חי העולמים[79]

'Life of the Worlds'. This term, expressing the attribute of God's eternity, is bound to take a spacious place in Rabbinic theology. It is, with the doctrines of omnipresence and omnipotence, the unbridgeable contrast between the Jewish doctrine of God, on one side, and all the other religions, primitive and higher as well, on the other side; the proper place of its treatment will be in one of the next chapters.

(40) חכם

'The Wise'. God is called wise, cf. Job 9. 4.[80] Some see this name indicated in Eccles. 8. 1; cf. Prov. 3. 19.[81]

(41) חסיד

'The Pious.' The Haggada which attempts to demonstrate the idea of the *imitatio dei* by pointing out that Israel is called by the same names as his Maker, puts together אלהים (v. no. 9), דוד (v. above, no. 35), חכם (v. above, no. 40), בחור (v. above, no. 17), and חסיד. God is called חסיד, cf. Jer. 3. 12; Israel Ps. 50. 5.[82] Sifre Dt. § 49, מה הקב"ה נקרא חסיד.

(42) טהור

'The Pure.' In the allegorical homily on the red heifer we read טהור, i. e. 'God', based on Hab. 1. 13.[83]

(43) טובו שלעולם or טוב

'Good', or 'the Goodness of the World.' The eulogy, ברוך הטוב והמטיב, expresses this attribute of God to be met with in all higher religions.[84] The identification טוב = הקב"ה is taught by R. Meir standing at the grave side of

[79] As to the pronunciation of חַי or חֵי there were many disputes among the codifiers and liturgical scholars of the Middle Ages, v. Marmorstein, וזאת ליהודה in שבלים, Budapest, 1926, p. 212.

[80] Tanh. iii. 74.

[81] Pes. B. 36 A; Eccles. r. 8. 1; Num. r. 19. 4.

[82] Tanh. iii. 74; v. M. Ps. B. 123; cf. Ps. 86. 2, and ib., p. 372.

[83] Tanh. iv. 120 and parall.

[84] Gen. r. 57, ed. Th. 613.

his teacher Elisha b. Abuja.[85] Again, in a statement which groups the things which are called טוב, e.g. God, Torah, Moses, and Israel.[86] The name of God is based on Ps. 145. 9. The name טובו or טיבותו 'of the world', occurs in a saying of R. Simon b. Halafta, saying: 'The arrogant prevailed over the pious, and more so over the Goodness of the World.[87]

(44) ידיד

'Friend.' Six are called friends, among them God; cf. Is. 5. 1.[88]

(45) יודע מחשבות

'He who knows the thoughts' of men; v. above, *sub* בעל מחשבות. R. Jose b. Halafta has a saying [pal. Sanh. 1. 1] אין אני יודע דין תורה אלא היודע מחשבות יפרע מאותן האנשים מקבלין עליכון מה דנא אמר לכון.

(46) יוצר עולמים

'Creator of the World', or shortened יוצר, used very frequently, especially to denote man's relation to God, and occurs in Tannaitic as well as in Amoraic sources. The Hebrew Testament of Naphtali has the passage[89]: רק אני מזהיר אתכם על אהבת היוצר ולעבדו ולדבקה בו. The Alfabetha of Sira says[90]: יגלה את לבו ומעשיו ליוצרו 'Let him reveal his heart and deeds to his Creator'. Stoics and Philo often use the parable of the potter (also יוצר) in their teleological proofs of God's existence.[91] This parable is very often repeated in the Haggada.[92] Great is, says R. Judan, the power of the seers, for they can compare the figure with the artist.[93] Generally some homilists found fault with

[85] j. Hag. 77 c; Ruth r. 6. 13. [86] B. Men. 53 B; M. Ps. B. 510.
[87] j. Taan. 2. 1; Pes. B. 161 A.
[88] Sifre Deut., § 352, p. 115; b. Men. 53 B; Pirke R. Hakadosh, vi. 38, ed. Schönblum, 17 B.
[89] ed. Wertheimer, בתי מדרשות, ii. 9. [90] Or. Brit. Mus. 5399, 81 B.
[91] De decal. ii, 189 ff.; Geffcken, loc. cit., xxvii.
[92] v. Gen. r. 34. 1, ibid. 14. 7; Pes. r. ch. 24. 125 A.
[93] Gen. r. 27. 1; v. also M. Ps. 2 B; Eccles. r. 2. 24, 8. 1.

people who dare to put the created thing higher than the Creator, or artist.[94] The teachers speak of יוצר בראשית ויוצר עולם,[95] and יוצר המאורות, or אור.[96] The name is connected with the idea of doing the Creator's will, or annoying Him.[97]

(47) יחודו של עולם

'The Unique of the World'. This name we meet in a saying of Ben Azzai, who preaches that Israel was not sent or driven into exile until he denied ביחודו שלעולם.[98] R. Judan preserved a homily of Aquilas, which teaches that God is worthy to be called God (אלוה). A king is being eulogized before he built public buildings for the city (*δημόσια*), or before he presented honours (*προκοπή*). The יחודו של עולם is different. First he does, then he is praised.[99] R. Judah b. Simon explains Gen. 3. 22 באחד by ביחודו של עולם.[100] Similarly באחד, Gen. 49. 16; Dan[1] is like יחודו של עולם, 'who needs no help in battle'; finally, Job 14. 4: מי יתן טהור מטמא לא אחד 'who gives the pure out of the impure?' like Abraham of Terah, Hezekiah of Ahaz, Mordecai of Shimei, Israel of the nations? The יחודו של עולם = אחד.[2] R. Phinehas b. Hama ascribes God's justice, R. Juda Halevi b. Shalom, God's omniscience to His uniqueness, i.e. His being יחודו של עולם.[3] We find further in answer to questions like מי עשה זאת?, or מי צוה כן?, not הקב"ה, but יחודו של עולם.[4]

[94] R. Hoshaja, Gen. r. 24. 1; R. Samuel b. Nahman 1. 3; M. Ps. 12 D, and Buber, p. 111, Wisdom of Solomon, 15. 16.

[95] v. בתי מדרשות, ed Wertheimer, i. 9; pal. Ber. 1. 5.

[96] b. Ber. 11 A, B.

[97] v. Ruth r. 3. 1; b. Ber. 17 A; R. Johanan b. Nappaha.

[98] Lam. r. 1. 1.

[99] Gen. r. ch. 1; Th., p. 10. The same idea is expressed by Ben Azzai and R. Simon b. Johai; v. also Pes. B. 30 B; Pes. r. 21 B; Num. r. 12. 5; Tanh. תשא 17.

[100] Gen. r. 21. 5, Th. 200.

[1] Gen. r. 98. 18, 99. 11; R. Joshua b. Nehemiah, Midrash ha-Gadol, Gen. 742; Num. r. 10. 5.

[2] Pes. B. 29 B and parall; v. also מעין גנים, ed. Buber, p. 45.

[3] Tanh. B. i. 97, ii. 9.

[4] Tanh. B. iv. 103, 104; v. also iii. 30.

(48) ישב בסתרו של עולם

'He who dwells in the hidden places of the world.' R. Simon b. Lakish explains Job 24. 15: '"The eye also of the adulterer waiteth for the twilight, saying, 'No eye shall see me', and disguiseth the face." Thou shalt not say: "He who sins with his body is an adulterer;" even he who sins with his eyes is also an adulterer, as it is said, "The eye is an adulterer. He sits and waits for the twilight, for the evening" (Prov. 7. 9). He does not know that He who sitteth in the Secret (בסתר) appoints (ישים) watchmen to make known his intentions (פנים = בלקטירים).'[5]

(49) יי

v. above, *sub* אלהים, and chapter 1.

(50) ישרו של עולם

'The righteous of the world.' The righteous will see God and God the righteous.[6]

(51) כבודו של עולם

'The Glory of the World.' This name is very frequent in the Targumim (יקרא), but rare in Rabbinic writings. We met the name in connexion with חי העולמים.[7] In Tannaitic sources we have כבודו של עולם for אלהים.[8] R. Anja b. Susi says: פעמים שאין העולם ומלואו מחזיקים כבודו.[9] Very often speaking of God, כבודי or כבודך or כבודו is substituted.[10]

[5] Pes. r. ch. 24. 124 B; Lev. r. 23. 12.

[6] M. Ps. ch. 11. 101 B,: אלא הם יראו פני ישרו של עולם וישרו של עולם יחזה פניהם של ישרים.

[7] v. above, *sub* no. 39, p. 85.

[8] Mekh. 58 A; v. esp. 60 A. R. Joshua b. Hananja: ישלחו בכבודו של עולם.

[9] Gen. r. Th. 28.

[10] Tanh. B. i. 69: אילולי שיתפתה כבודך עמי; ii. 101: אמר הקב"ה אני ארד בכבודי; v. also iv. 17 and 18; Midr. Ps., Buber, 209: דומה והנסא לכבודו; Pirke R. Eliezer, chaps. 10, 26, and 53; Seder Elijahu r., p. 53.

(52) כבשונו שלעולם

'The Secret of the World.' It is doubtful whether this can be regarded as a name. The name occurs only once,[11] and means the secrets of the world, i.e. of creation and theosophy, which must not be revealed.

(53) לבו של ישראל

'The Heart of Israel.' R. Hijja b. Abba proves that God is called the heart of Israel from Ps. 73. 26.[12]

(54) מבין

'Who understands.' Occurs in the Mishna[13] in the list of names enumerated by R. Eleazar ha-Kappar.

(55) מזנא דעלמא

'The Supplier of the World.' In Cant. 7. 4 אל יחסר המזג we read the remark: לא נחסר מזנא דעלמא; cf. Ps. 23.[14]

(56) מי שאמר והיה העולם

'He, who spake and the world was.' This is one of the characteristic Tannaitic terms for God. Almost in all cases where this Name occurs one can assume that the saying is of Tannaitic origin. Some of the oldest Scribes known to us by name used it. Yet it has been discovered in an old Sumerian Psalm, therefore must be very old. 'Overpowering, exalted, at Thy word which created the world, Lord of Lords, Lord of the Word of Life, Father, Shepherd, &c.'[15] Owing to the discovery of this ancient name in Sumero-Babylonian literature, we can trace the origin of this term to the oldest stage of religious thought.

[11] b. Hag. 13 A.
[12] Cant. r. 5. 2; Tanh. B. i. 137; Pes. B. 46 B; Lam. r., ed. Buber, 13.
[13] Aboth iv. 22. [14] Cant. r. 7. 6.
[15] Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, 127.

(57) מי שענה . . .

'He who heard', scil. the prayers of Abraham, Isaac, &c. The name was invoked in great public distress or serious calamities. and is to be found in the ancient order of service for Public Fast days as described in the Mishna (Taanith ii. 3 ff.), v. Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 83, *Ritus*, p. 122 f., Kaufmann, *Ges. Schriften*, iii. 517.

(58) מי ששיכן את שמו בבית הזה

'He who caused His Name to dwell in this House.' According to R. Helbo, the priestly division, that left on Saturday the service of the Temple greeted the entering division with the words: may He, who caused his Name to dwell in this place, grant you love and affection, peace and friendship.[16]

(59) מלך מלכי המלכים

'King of all kings.' The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha offer many parallels to this name.[17] In all cases without הקב"ה. Our sources add in the majority of cases this latter term, which, as will be seen afterwards, belongs to a later period. The name occurs in the earliest sources, and we are entitled to assume that הקב"ה is a later addition, to distinguish between God and the Roman or another emperor, who aspired to this honoured, ancient title. The original name was מלך מלכי המלכים ברוך הוא, the latter words have been frequently added to המקום, שמים and other names. The Apocrypha offer also instances of עליון ברוך הוא[18] or חי עולמים ברוך הוא.[19] 'King of all kings' is used by the oldest authorities in our sources.

[16] b. Ber. 12 A, מי ששכן את שמו בבית הזה הוא ישכון ביניכם אהבה ואחוה ושלום וריעות. Other Names beginning with מי are: מי שברך אבותינו, v. Zunz, *Ritus*, p. 9; and מי שעשה נסים לאבותינו.

[17] Bousset, loc. cit., 360. [18] Jub. 22, 27.

[19] Enoch i. 77. 1. The Hebrew text of the Test. Naph., ch. ix, has הקב"ה, most probably a later addition.

(60) מעון

'Abode.' The name מעון is used especially in oaths,[20] and was derived from Deut. 33. 27 and Ps. 90. 1. R. Isaac explains similarly to R. Jose b. Halafta's interpretation of the name המקום: We do not know whether מעון is the abode of the world, or the world is His abode; from Ps. 90. 1, one can learn that God is the abode of the universe.[21] This exegesis, surely, is far from pantheistic conceptions. It endeavours to emphasize the doctrine of God's omnipresence, as will be shown in the attributes of God.

(61) מעלה

'Above', or 'High.' This name is generally used to signify that nothing happens on earth unless it is provided or ordered by God. R. Hannina b. Hama says: אין אדם נוקף אצבעו מלמטה אא"כ מכריזין עליו מלמעלה[22] 'A man does not hurt his finger below, unless it is decreed from Above.' R. Samuel b. Nahmani makes the serpent say: אפשר דאנא עביד כלום דלא מתאמר לי מן עליותא[23] 'Is it possible for me to do something which I was not commanded to do from Above?' This was repeated and enlarged by R. Abba b. Kahana: אין לעולם הנחש נושך אלא אם כן נלחש לו מלעיל, ואין הארי טורף אא"כ נלחש לו מלמעלה, ואין המלכות מתגרה בבני אדם אא"כ נלחש לו מלעיל.[24] The three names מעלה, שמים, and עליון occur in the same sense. The saying of these teachers coincides with R. Simon b. Johai's sentence: אפילו צפור מבלעדי שמיא לא אצדיא 'No bird is caught by the fowler without the consent of Heaven'.[25] Another version of the saying reads: מה צפרין חוין מדעת עליון אינן נתפסין אנו חוין מדעת עליון נתפסין.[26] The change between these terms appears noteworthy.

[20] v. my *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, ii. 69.

[21] Gen. r. 68 and further under המקום.

[22] Cf. Ps. 37. 23 and Prov. 20. 24; b. Hullin, 7 B.

[23] Lev. r. 26. 1; Num. r. 19. 2. [24] Eccles. r. 10. 14

[25] Pes. B. 89 A; MS. Oxford. r. לא יבדא, Pal. Shebiith, 9. 1; לא יבדה v. Arukh, s. v. בדה, Tos. A. Z. 16 B, s. v. דימום, Eccles. r; חופר גומין Esther r. ch. 3.

[26] M. Ps. 17.

Secondly, מעלה is used when the Scribes express or report man's feelings for or speech against God, כלפי מעלה[27], or to avoid and weaken anthropomophism, e.g. עין של מעלה אינה רואה.[28] Thirdly, it stands for מרום, e.g. מיד תלה עשו את עיניו למעלה,[29] or עליון[30] and in connexion with מעלה של מעלה.[31]

(62) מקום

'Place.' This name is often discussed. Some scholars see in it Hellenistic-Alexandrian influence,[32] others derived it from the Bible,[33] a third view looks to a Persian origin.[34] Bousset thought that this Name seems to have had its origin very late, although it occurs frequently in the Mishna. There is no trace, according to Bousset, of it in the literature of the first century.[35] Our investigation shows that Simon the Just,[36] *c.* 300 B.C.E., was the first of whom we know with certainty that he used this term. It is very significant for the date of the Targumim, as well as of the Gospels that neither המקום, nor its Greek (*τόπος*), or Aramaic (אתרא) equivalents are used or known.[37] Our material shows that the oldest strata of the Tannaitic sources used המקום. A small Midrash called מדרש תמורה[38] preserved the report that מקום was the Name used by the

[27] Gen. r. 119, 572; Tanh. iii. 66; R. Simon b. Lakish ibid. v. 39; R. Joh. b. Nap.; Ms. Ps. 97, R. Aha.

[28] Num. r. 94. [29] Tanh. i. 4, v. 25.

[30] Tanh. i. 19: בקש לגנוב דעת של מעלה.

[31] M. Ps. 177, R. Aha.

[32] Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, Stuttgart, 1838, p. 290 f.; Dähne, *Gesch. Darstellung*, pp. 72, 282; Siegfried, *Philo*, pp. 202, 204; Freudenthal, *Hell. Studien*, p. 66; Geiger's *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, xi, p. 222; A. Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, Berlin, 1884, 102, note; Heinemann, *MGWJ.*, 66, 1922, p. 310, note, who denies the use of המקום in Hellenistic writings altogether.

[33] Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 424; Schürer, *Jahrbücher für prot. Theologie*, ii. 1876, 168.

[34] E. Landau, *Synonyma für Gott*, Zurich, 1888, 41 ff.

[35] *Die Religion des Judenthums*,[2] 363.

[36] And not Simon b. Shetach, as Landau, loc. cit., 43, on which his theory of Persian origin is based, thought.

[37] Already noticed by Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, Leipzig, 1898, p. 189.

[38] ed. Wertheimer, Jerusalem, 1914.

אנשי לשכת הגזית,[39] i.e. the Synhedrion. The antiquity of some parts of this Midrash is corroborated by the use of המקום, and old material preserved in it,[40] although the final redaction of the Midrash may be put in the Amoraic period.[41] In the third century, when המקום was already displaced by the Amoraic term הקב׳ה, the Haggadist R. Ami pondered on the meaning of this name. This also corroborates our contention that the change must have taken place in this century. The movements in favour of a change started earlier. It can be traced back to the last decades of the second century, when the sages were moved to give explanations or defend its use, as it was done by R. Jose b. Halafta, or according to others, by R. Meir.[42] For our purpose here it is sufficient to point out the antiquity of this Name, and its disappearance in the time of the earlier Amoraim.

(63) מרום

'High', 'Heaven.' Identical with עליון and שמים, and especially used in connexion with prayers, like תלה עינו במרום.[43]

(64) מרותיה של עולם

'The Lordship of the world.' R. Phinehas b. Hama interprets the word מוריה by למקום מרותיה של עולם.[44]

(65) מרי

'My Lord.' R. Jose b. Halafta speaks of מרי שמיא 'Lord of Heaven', in replying to a heathen: 'We trust in the

[39] With reference to Middoth, v. 6: ברוך המקום; cf. also Mekh. 52 B.

[40] Marmorstein, 'Die Nachrichten über Nekyomanteia in der altrabbinischen Literatur, in *ZfNW*. 22, 1923, p. 303.

[41] v., however, Zunz, *Gottesd. Vortr.* 118; Rab Pealim, 123; Jellinek, Bet ha Midrash i, p. xx, certainly older than 1250.

[42] Gen. r. 68; M. Ps. 90, 10; Pes. r. 107 B; Exod. r. 45. 6; Pirke R. E., Tanh. B. ii., and according to Simon b. Zemach Duran, in his commentary on Aboth ii. 9, in the third chapter of Pal. Maccoth, which is, however, not to be found in the editions: v. now ed. Theodor, p. 777.

[43] Gen. r. 65. 5.

[44] Gen. r. 55. 9; Tanh. i. 113; v. also Tanh. ii. 38, R. Aha: שלא קיבלו מרותו שלעו׳.

Lord of Heaven, who will show us His countenance in the future world.[45] Corresponding to אדון העולם and רבון העולם we find also מריה דעלמא.[46]

(66) עד

'Witness.' Eleazar ha-Kappar, in his list of God's names, gives also this designation.[47] In the Tanhuma the question is raised: 'Whence do we know that God is called עד?' The reply refers to Jer. 29. 23: ואנכי היודע ועד נאם ה'.[48]

(67) עליון

'High.' This name, as one of the oldest, heads the list of God's names enumerated in an old Midrash.[49] It is frequently used in Psalms and Pseudepigraphic writings. In our period it had already an archaic sound, but it was still used in a few instances. R. Aibo speaks of נגונב דעת חעליונה,[50] or אלא שנשתנית ימין של עליון.[51]

(68) עשירו של עולם

'The Wealthy of the World.' R. Tanhuma combines Deut. 3. 23 with Prov. 18. 23. The poor, who speaketh entreaties is Moses, who comes before his Creator with supplications. The rich, who answereth roughly is the Rich of the World, whose reply was, 'Do not continue to speak to me any further.'[52]

(69) עתיקו של עולם

'The Ancient of the World.' This name occurs once. Its proper meaning is also a matter of conjecture owing to

[45] Gen. r. 131; M. Ps. 30; M. Lam. r. 28; b. Ber. 6A תפילין דמארי עלמא.

[46] Gen. r. 272, 99. 3; M. Ps. 236; M. Lam. r. 84.

[47] Aboth iv. 22. [48] Tanh. iii. 9.

[49] Agadath Shir ha-Shirim, ed. Schechter, Camb., 1896, 9; Yalkut Makhiri, Ps. 97 A; Midrash Zutta, ed. Buber.

[50] Gen. r. 220; v. R. Berechja, 140: דגנב דעתיה דמריה; v. also Tanh. i. 19: דעת של מעלה; Pes. B. 160 A.

[51] M. Ps 267; v. also p. 344.

[52] Deut. r. 2. 3; v. Sifre Deut., § 26.

the bad texts. Ruth r. reads: ר׳ איבו אמר אפילו דברים שנתעסקו בהם החזירם שנ׳ פסל לך וג׳ הדברים הללו נאמרו במעתיקו של עולם.[53] Yalkut[54] reads: וחדברים עתיקים ר׳ איבו ורבי סימן אומר הדברים האלו אומרים מעתיקו של עולם. The words speak of the ancient of the world. The term is identical with the well-known עתיק יומין, or עתיק יומיא, v. also b. Ber. 17 A ופעמיך ירוצו לשמוע דברי עתיק יומין.

(70) פועל

'Maker.' R. Eleazar, the son of R. Jose, the Galilean, says: מהו אמרו לאלהים, אמרו לפועליך הטוב והישר.[55]

(71) פנים

'Countenance.' In sayings, as כאילו כנף מכסה את הפנים,[56] in order to avoid anthropomorphic ideas, or כל הפנים שוות, 'All the deities are alike.'[57]

(72) צור עולמים

'The Rock of the Worlds.' R. Simai in his prayers invokes God, as אדון כל הבריות, אלוה התושבחות צור העולמים חי העולם יוצר בראשית 'The Lord of all the creatures, God of praises, Rock of the Worlds, Everlasting Creator.'[58] 'The Rock' is a favourite simile in Biblical as well as Babylonian-Assyrian hymnology.[59] We find further the saying אין צור אלא הקב"ה, v. b. Berak. 6 A.

(73) צדיקו של עולם

'The Righteous of the World.' Also צדיק חי העולמים. We begin with a sermon of Bar-Kappara, reported by R. Huna, based on Ps. 31. 19, 'Let the lying lips be put to silence, which speak grievous things proudly and contemptuously against the righteous.' תאלמנה ('let them be put to silence') means (*a*) אתפרכן 'they shall become tied', cf. Targum to Gen. 37. 7; (*b*) איתחרשן 'deaf and dumb',

[53] Ruth r. ii. 1.
[54] Chronicles, § 1074.
[55] Tanh. ii. 54.
[56] Tanh. v. 45.
[57] M. Ps. 47, and Parall; Pes. B. 29 A, 162 B.
[58] Pal. Ber. 1. 5.
[59] *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, ii. 79, 83.

cf. Exod. 4. 11; and (*c*) 'silenced, for they speak against the Zaddik, the Everlasting, things which He removed from His creatures.'[60] Another teacher explains, Is. 3. 10: אמרו צדיק כי טוב 'say unto the Righteous of the World that He is good', combining the attribute of righteousness with that of goodness.[61] Prov. 21. 15: שמחה לצדיק עשות משפט 'It is a joy to the righteous of the world when He performs judgement', for he then is exalted in the world.[62] A fourth teacher combines Gen. 9. 18 and Ps. 37. 16: טוב מעט לצדיק 'Better are Israel in the eyes of the righteous of the world although they are only a few (cf. Deut. 7. 7) than the hosts of the wicked.'[63] Abraham says to God, according to R. Judah [b. Simon]: לא את צדיקו של עולם צרף עצמך עמהן ויעלו מנין חמשים.[64] 'The Righteous of the world knows even the soul of his cattle; (cf. Prov. 12. 10) even in His anger He shows His love to His creatures.'[65] Eccles. 3. 16 is explained: מקום הצדק שמה הרשע, מקום אחד היה לצדיקו שלעולם בהמ'ק המיוחד לשכינה והרשיעו מנשה.[66] 'God is the Righteous of the world because he is omniscient; He knows and sees our hearts and sinews.' This saying connects the two attributes of God's knowledge and justice.[67] R. Judah b. Shalom identifies צדיק, Is. 3. 10, with God; cf. Ps. 11. 7.[68] Prov. 13. 25, צדיק אוכל לשובע נפשו, is referred to God and

[60] Gen. r. ch. 1, Th., p. 2, ; j. Hag. 77c

[61] M. Ps. B. 481; Pes. B. 73 B; v. also M. Ps 324.

[62] M. Ps. B. 33, another reading for שמחה לצדיקו של עולם שנעשה מדת הדין בביתו והחריבו; v. on this idea, Marmorstein, *Einige messianologische Vorstellungen des dritten Jahrhunderts neu beleuchtet*, in *Jeschurun*, xi, 1924, pp. 323–42.

[63] Ag. Ber. B. 23 f.; v. also the term צדיק עולמים above, sub no. 73, חי העולמים, sub no. 39.

[64] Gen. r. ch. 48, Th., p. 510.

[65] Tanh. B. i. 35; Ag. Ber. r. יודע צדיקו של עולם אפי בחמתו instead of בהמתי; v. Tanh. B. iii. 95: צדיק זה הקב'ה; Pes. B. 78 B.

[66] Tanh. B. iii. 6.

[67] M. Ps. B. 67; v. further, p. 98: צדיק העולם הוא הקב'ה מה פעולה הניחו לך בעולמך; secondly מה הנייה יש לך בעולמך ובפעולתך; and finally צדיק העולם מה פעולה פעלת.

[68] M. Ps., p. 323; v. also above, note 61; v. also ib., p. 465 on Isa. 41. 2.

the sacrifices accepted by Him.[69] R. Hanina sees in Job 17. 9 references to God. צדיק is God; cf. Ps. 15. 7. טהר ידים; v. Hab. 1. 13; יוסיף אומץ 'for He strengthens the power of the pious to do his will.[70]

(74) הקדוש ברוך הוא

'The Holy One, blessed be He.' It will be shown later on that this name was introduced in the third century, and took the place of the earlier המקום. We have shown that it is a late addition in the name מלך מלכי המלכים הקב'ה. Here we point to the fact that neither the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, nor the N. T. know this name. Targum Onkelos must have been compiled before this name was introduced in the schools and synagogues. The later Targum, ascribed to Jonathan b. Uzziel,[70a] which borrowed liberally from the Midrashim, use it very often. The great step by which the religion of Judaism advanced in adopting this name, will be fully dealt with in speaking of God's holiness. It suffices to hint at the fact that all-important and vital external and internal problems, which threatened the whole fabric of Jewish religion, brought about such a change. All the forces, Paganism and Gnosticism, Christianity and Atheism, arrayed against Jewish teaching and belief, combined to threaten the very existence of Israel. The idea of holiness hallowed Israel, just as Israel sanctified God!

(75) קדמונו של עולם

'The first of the World.' R. Eleazar b. Simon sees in Gen. 11. 2 (ויהי בנסעם מקדם) an allusion to the thoughts of the generation of the separation. They removed from the

[69] Pes. B. 60 A.

[70] Pes. B. 166 A; v. further Midrash Othijoth of R. Akiba, ed. Wertheimer, 48 B, and Sifre, § 49: מה הקב'ה נקרא צדיק.

[70a] We have this name also in Aramaic: קודשא בריך הוא, v. b. Ber. 5 B, 6 A, 7 A, 10 A, מי חשיד קודשא בריך הוא דעביד דינא בלא דינא, or ומי איכא רותחא קמיה דקודב'ה, ומי כושבח קודב'ה בשבחין דישראל, and ומה דניחא קמיה דקודב'ה הוא לעביד.

first of the world, saying: 'We do not want either Him, or His Godhead.'[71] A similar explanation is given to Gen. 13. 11 with reference to Lot.[72]

(76) קונה

'Creator', 'Possessor.' In the Mishna we read: כל שלא חס על כבוד קונו ראוי לו שלא בא לעולם.[73] Further, in a saying of R. Johanan b. Zakkai: זה השוה כבוד עבד לכבוד קונו.[74] A Boraita teaches that Sandalphon קושר כתר לקונו.[75] R. Levi quotes in the name of R. Jose b. Nahorai: כל זמן שהיו ידי קוניהם ממשמשים בהם היו מותחים והולכים ביון שנחו ידי קוניהם נותן להם ניחה וינח לעולמו.[76] In anonymous sayings we come across sentences like דיו לעבד להיות שוה לקונו,[77] which reminds us of R. Johanan b. Zakkai's homily, or השוו עבד לקונו;[78] further, שהלך בתמימות עם קונו[79] and לעשות רצון קונו שבשמ'.[80] The wife of R. Simon b. Halafta says to her husband: שמא הטרחת את קונך?[81] These instances show the double meaning of the name: Creator and Master.

(77) רבון כל המעשים

'Lord of all works.' R. Joshua b. Hananja repeats the question of the generation of Amalek: אם רבון כל המעשים הוא בשם שהוא רבון עלינו נעבדנו ואם לאו לא 'If He is the Lord of all works just as He is our Lord, then we will worship

[71] Gen. r. ch. 38, Th. 356.

[72] Gen. r. ch. 40, Th. 394; v. Tobia b. Eliezer in his לקח טוב, i. 62, who saw in קדמונו שלעולם a reference to Abraham: נסע מקדמונו של עולם זה אברהם שהיה ראש אמנה. M. Aggada 28, reads: מקדמותו שלעולם; Rashi, ed. Berliner, p. 24: הסיע עצמו מקדמונו של עולם אמר אי אפשי באברהם ולא באלהיו.

[73] M. Hagiga, ii. 1, 11 A; v. also R. Joshua b. Korha, Pirke R. E. ch. 25.

[74] Mekh. 91 B 6; B. K. 79 B; v. also Mekh. 37 A: אי אפשר להנוות לקונו.

[75] B. Hag. 13 A; Pirke R. E. ch. 4.

[76] Gen. r. Th. 86.

[77] Tanh. i. 79; v. also M. Ps. B. 532: שעבד נכנם לדין עם קונו; v. also Agad. Bereshith B. 34.

[78] Ib. iv. 125.

[79] Ib. iv. 178, usually לעשות רצון המקום.

[80] Ib. v. 2.

[81] M. Ps. B. 408.

Him, otherwise not.'[82] In another source[83] the very same question is quoted in a Haggada of R. Judah b. Ilai.

(78) רבון כל העולמים

'Lord of all Worlds.' This name is one of the most frequently used in addressing God. Our texts have רבונו של עולם and רבון העולמים. The former is the more correct. It is most unlikely that the rabbis should have paid no attention to the contentions of the Gnostic sects, who saw in the God of the Jews 'the Lord of this world.'

(79) רואה ואינו נראה

'He who sees and is invisible.' A blind man says to R. Hoshaja: 'Thou didst appease one who is seen and cannot see'. את פייסת דין דמתחמי ולא חמי דין דחמי ולא מתחמי יקבל פיוכך 'May He, who sees everything, but cannot be seen, accept thy apology.'[84] In Hebrew very frequently הרואה ואינו נראה is applied, for instance, in the comparison of God to the soul: 'God is invisible and sees everything, so the soul sees everything and is invisible.'[85]

(80) רוח הקודש

'The Holy Spirit.' This term has been discussed more recently by various scholars, and deserves a new and full treatment from more than one aspect. From a survey of the whole material in our sources we gather that generally the rabbis understood by it the spirit of prophecy or divination. Many a time it bears the same meaning as the term שכינה. It occurs in the following connexions: (1) רוח הק׳ אומרת, (2) השיבה, (3) צווחת, (4) שראה, 5) הופיע, (6) להקביל, (7) צפה, (8) ברוח הק׳, (9) ראה ב׳, (10) חזא ב׳, (11) כינס ב׳, (12) ביטלה ממנו, (13) נסתלקה, (14) נצנצה בהם, (15) שואב רוח הק׳, (16) סוכים ברוח הק׳, (17) סמך ברוח הק׳, (18) השתמש ברוח הק׳, (19) משיח רוח הק׳, (20) קפצה עליו רוח הק׳, (21) זכה לרוח הק׳, נזקק לרוח הקדש,

[82] Mekh. 52 B. [83] Pes. B. 28 A.
[84] Peah 8. 8; v. also the story of the blind man and R. Eliezer b. Jacob.
[85] B. Ber. 10 A and parall.

(22) מכרחת, and (23) נתקררה. In some instances רוח הקודש means God, and acts as a substitute for the Divine Name. Two examples will suffice to show this. A homily on Eccles. 8. 2 has: אמר להם רוח הקודש משביע אני עליכם שאם תגזור עליכם מלכות גזרות אל תמרדו עליה 'The Holy Spirit says to Israel, "I put an oath on you; if the Government put hard decrees on you, do not revolt."' Some editions actually have הקב'ה instead of רוח הקודש.[86] In another passage: ורוח הקודש צווחת ואומרת להם אתם סבורים שאתם עושין בסתר ואינו גלוי לפני 'The Holy Spirit cried, "Ye think that ye are doing your work in hidden places, and it is not revealed before me!"'[87] Many other instances are available which cannot be enumerated in this place.[88] They all belong to the Amoraic period, when the change from המקום to הקב'ה was really accomplished. Do we find traces of this use also in the Ṭannaitic age? There is no old saying of that period known in which רוח הק׳ is used as a Divine Name. A somewhat lengthy dialogue, which will engage our special attention later, between Israel and the Holy Spirit,[89] shows clearly that the Tannaim understood under רוח הקודש, prophets and prophecy.

(81) רומו של עולם

'The Height of the World.' A Haggadist reports a dialogue between the Egyptian and his horse. The former says to his horse: 'Yesterday I led thee in order to give thee water, and now thou desirest to drown me in the sea'. The latter replies: 'רמה בים, i.e. see (ראה) what is (מה) in the sea? I see the Highest of the world whom I see in the sea' (רומו של עולם אני רואה בים).[90]

(82) רועה

'Shepherd.' God as shepherd of all men is an old name for God in the Prophets and Psalms. The same was not

[86] Tanh. B. i. 38; Ag. Ber. ch. 7, ed. Tanh. הקב'ה.
[87] Tanh. ii. 68.
[88] v., for instance, M. Ps. B. 137, 138.
[89] Sifre Deut., § 355.
[90] Exod. r. 23. 14.

unknown to polytheistic speculations on the Godhead.[91] In the Haggada God is generally the owner of the flock, and Moses the shepherd.[92] Yet there are instances of the older conception. R. Abba b. Kahana says that 'God delivered Israel from Egypt, as a shepherd delivers the young from the mother's womb'.[93] R. Hanina, the son of R. Aha compares Job's case to a shepherd who is taking a look over his flock: suddenly comes a wolf and threatens it; the shepherd puts a goat at his disposal.[94] God is the shepherd, Satan the wolf, Job the goat.

(83) רחמנא

'Merciful.' Although this term is more frequent in the sayings of the Babylonian teachers in the period of the Amoraim, we find the same also with Tannaim and Palestinian Amoraim. R. Huna says in the name of Rab, who said it in the name of R. Meir, and it was likewise taught in the name of R. Akiba: 'One should accustom oneself to say: כל מה דעביד רחמנא לטב עביד "Whatever God does is done for the best."'[95] It is to be noted that the saying is Aramaic, and R. Akiba must have used it as a well known and accepted maxim. It is not impossible to assume that Hillel brought the same with him from his Babylonian native country and his pupils spread it abroad. R. Simon b. Johai[96] uses it in his saying, also preserved in Aramaic: אלו הוינא קאים על טורא דסיני בשעתא דאתיהיבת תורה לישראל הוינ' מתבעי קומו רחמנא. The antiquity of this name is proved by its use in prayers and blessings. It is used interchangeably with המקום.[97] Prayers or homilies are introduced by בריך רחמנא.[98] R. Phinehas b. Hama notes to Eccles. 6. 2: 'God does not give

[91] v. Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, 105.

[92] v., for instance, Ruth. r. ch. 5; M. Ps. 22 A, 34 B; Mekh. 33 B.

[93] M. Ps. 462. [94] Gen. r. 57. 3.

[95] b. Ber. 60 B. [96] b. Ber. 1. 2.

[97] b. Sabb. 12: המקום יפקדך לשלום; in Aramaic: רחמנא ידכרוך לשלם.

[98] v. the Galilean before R. Hisda Sabb. 88; R. Shela b. Ber. 62; b. Ber. 53 B, 54 B; Pes. 57.

wealth, property, and honour only to those whom He likes', (מאן דרחמנא רעי ביה)[99]; in Hebrew: אלא במי שירצה בו הקב׳ה.[100] We mention finally R. Jeremiah's saying: לא ליהוי לימא אינש רחמנא ירחיק חטאה אלא ירחיק חטאה מינן,[1] and R. Judan who says: מאן דאמר רחמנא וותרן יתוותרון בני מועהי.[2]

(84) רם ונשא

'The High and Lofty One.' In an old mystical Midrash dealing with cosmogony we read: ומינן שנקרא הב׳ה רם ונשא שנ׳ כי כה אמר רם ונשא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו.[3] The Midrash Haggada[4] contains the passage: מי עשה זה הקב׳ה שהוא רם ונשא. The name is derived from Isa. 57. 15. This verse suggested to some teachers of the third century the idea of God's humility. God is high and lofty, yet He is with him that is contrite and humble in spirit. We mention here only R. Johanan[5] and R. Eleazar b. Pedath.[6] The latter preached very strongly and frequently against the vice of pride and haughtiness, as will be shown later.[7]

(85) שוכן עדי עד

'He who dwells for ever.' This name occurs only once, and is formed by scholars of Babylon. It is given here for completeness' sake. R. Huna b. Nathan asked R. Ashi about the names קינה דימונה ועדעדה in Josh. 15. 22. R. Ashi said: 'The text enumerates the boundaries of the land of Israel.' R. Huna: 'Do you mean to suggest that I am not aware of this fact?' but R. Gebiha of Arqiza gave the

[99] M. Sam. B. 44.

[100] Eccles. r. on 6. 2.

[1] M. Ps. 436.

[2] ib. 93 Pal.; Shekalim, 48 D; Taanit, 68 D; Beza, 62 B; Gen. r. 67. 4; Esther r. ch. 7; Tanh. כי תשא, 26; B. K. 50 A.

[3] v. מעשה בראשית in Wertheimer; בתי מדרשות, ii. 15.

[4] ed. Buber, Ex. 145.

[5] b. Meg. 5 A: כל מקום שאתה מוצא גדולתו של הקב׳ה שם אתה מוצא עניתנותו; he proves this from all the three parts of the Bible.

[6] Jelamdenu, v. Tanh. B. i. 84: בשבע מקומות השוה הקב׳ה את עצמו בחבורת הנמוכים.

[7] v. Sota 5 a.

following explanation: 'He who is jealous of his fellow man and keeps silent, He who dwells for ever will judge on his behalf'. R. Ashi replied: 'How will you explain the names צקלג ומדמנה וסנסנה?' ib. 15. 31. R. Huna said: 'If R. Gebiha could be present he surely would expound it'. R. Aha of Be Huzaah explained it thus: 'He who has a complaint against his fellow men of ruining his trade (צעקת לגימא), and he keeps silent, He who dwelleth in the thorn bush will do his judgement' (מי ששוכן בסנה).[8] The teachers delighted in deriving ethical and moral teachings from geographical or personal names.

(86) שומר עולמים

'The Guardian of the Worlds.' In a homiletical exposition of Isaiah 21. 11 we read: 'Israel said to the prophet. "Our teacher Isaiah! tell us what will deliver us of this night?"' Isaiah says: 'Wait till I have asked!' After he had asked, he returns to them. They ask: 'What did the Guardian of the Worlds say (שומר מה מילל)?'[9] In the Hebrew Sirah[10] we find the term שומר ישראל, which occurs also in the old prayer beginning השכיבנו.[11]

(87) שבינה

'The Divine Presence.' Landau[12] asserts that Shekhina is the latest of God's names used in the last period before the redaction of the Mishna. Then he points out that R. Akiba, who shows many variants in using God's names,[13] was probably the first to apply it. If our texts are reliable we could trace it back to R. Gamaliel II, who said: אלא ללמדך שאין בארץ מקום פנוי מן השבינה.[14] R. Zadok, a contemporary

[8] b. Gittin, 7 A. [9] j. Taan. 67 A. [10] ch. 51. 12.
[11] v. Marmorstein, Jesus Sirach, 51. 12 ff. in *ZAW.* 29 (1909), p. 291.
[12] *Synonyma für Gott*, 48.
[13] Like שמים, אבינו מלכנו, גבוה, רחמנא, אבינו שבשמים, המקום and מי שאמר והיה העולם. The same can be proved in the cases of others, e.g. R. Johanan b. Zakkai, or the Amoraic Haggadist, R. Aha, and many more.
[14] Pes. B. 2 B, also Num. r. 14. 4; v. however, Midr. Ct. r. 3. 9; Exod. r.

of R. Gamaliel says: מניינו גדול מרבן גמליאל ומאברהם ששימש את הבריות א'ל אי זה זה אמר להם שכינה שכל שעה מספיק מזון לכל באי עולם כדי צרכן.[15] R. Eleazar, of Modiim, speaks of proselytes: ואקרבם תחת כנפי השכינה.[16] R. Ishmael, the opponent of R. Akiba, uses the same term in the Halakha, which would support the idea that Shekhina is a much older term, if we can rely on the experience made with other terms, e.g. שמים, or גבוה.[17] The name is frequently put together with השרה, סלק, נהנה מזיו, and זנו עיניהם. It may be that the people, after the destruction of the Temple, popularized this name in order to indicate that in spite of the loss of Temple and land, the divine presence was still in Israel. Its frequent occurrence in the Targumim is most noticeable. It is by no means impossible that the שכינה stands in the Aramaic versions for מקום, both of which point to the dwelling-place of God. This would help to throw light on the still unsettled, very important literary problem as to the date of the various versions. Here again it is most noteworthy that the N. T. does not contain any reference to this name.[18]

(88) שלום העולמים

'The Peace of the Worlds.' R. Berekhja interprets the word שולמית (Cant. 7. 1) by אומה ששלום העולמים דר בתוכה 'a nation in whose midst the peace of the worlds dwells.'[19] In the Midrash, ed. Grünhut, p. 43 B, we read: ואומה מי ששמו שלום דר בתוכה. Ulla and other Babylonian scholars also saw in שלום one of God's names.[20] The name is based on the peace-bringing and peace-making efforts of God.[21]

2. 9; R. Joshua b. Korha. The former reading (R. Gamaliel) is given in Mekh. R. S. b. J. 2.

[15] Mekh. 59 A; Siphre Deut. 38; b. Kid. 32 B. [16] ib. 60 A.

[17] Sifra 1 B: קל וחומר לשכינה.

[18] v. Dalman, loc. cit., p. 187.

[19] Gen. r. 66. 3; Cant. r. 71; some read: אומה ששלום חי העולמים וכו.

[20] b. Shabb. 10 B.

[21] Pes. B. 2 B–3 A: המלך שהשלים מעשיו עם הבריות, and המלך שהוא עושה שלום בבריותיו.

He reconciles the conflicts between and within His creatures. The Tannaitic Midrash derives this name of God from Judges 6. 24.[22]

(89) השם

'The Name.' R. Joshua b. Hananja says: הושע השם את עמך ישראל.[23] R. Ishmael and R. Akiba speak of קידוש השם without שם שמים[24]; R. Phinehas b. Jair of חלול השם.[25] In some sources השם substitutes the older המקום or רחמנא.[26]

(90) שמים

'Heaven.'[27] Bousset is inclined to see in this name of God another influence of Persian religion on Jewish theology,[28] whilst Jewish scholars[29] thought of Greek prototypes. The truth is with neither party. Most origins are dark and obscure. Very seldom can one lift the veil of antiquity. One thing is certain that the use of this name is earlier than both Persian and Greek periods. 'The God of Heavens and Earth' is known to all readers of the Bible. In our period the name was used exclusively in a ritual and legal sense. The Nazirite, who relates his story to Simon the Just, offers a good example. He defeated his evil inclination by sanctifying his beautiful hair to heaven.[30] This lad was an ordinary shepherd from the South. He did not believe in a transcendental God, who is far away removed in Heaven. He felt His presence near in the meadow, near the well, where his senses tempted him to commit a sin. We find therefore in vows,[31] offerings to the

[22] Sifre Num., § 42: ששמו של הקב׳ה נקרא, ed. Horowitz, p. 47; some read המקום instead of הקב׳ה.

[23] M. Ber. 29 B. [24] b. B. K. 113 A. [25] ib.

[26] Midrash Agada, Ex. 177: השם יעמידך למקומך לשלום, instead of המקום יפקדך לשלום, or רחמנא ידברינך לשלם.

[27] v. also רקיע, cf. b. Ber. 3 B: מי איכא ספיקא קמי רקיע.

[28] *Die Religion des Judentums*[2], Berlin, 1906, 359, n. 3.

[29] v. Jacob Brüll, מבוא המשנה, i. 14; v. also Pseudo-Hekataios, cf Geffcken, loc. cit., p. xi and p. 19.

[30] Sifre Num., § 22, and Parall.

[31] b. Pes. 56 A; Sifre Deut., § 306.

sanctuary,[32] oath,[33] and prayers [34] the name of Heaven mentioned. The examples, which were taken from daily life, show that the name was really antiquated and belonged to the language of cult or law. Just as אלהים, or אלהי ישראל after they were eliminated from daily conversation, were retained on such occasions, so the name השמים. In legal portions of the Halakha the terms מיתה בידי שמים or נקי בידי שמים corroborate the same conception.[35] R. Akiba, who uses one of these terms, knew that 'Heaven and Earth' were regarded by some, especially by the Greeks, as deities,[36] surely would have objected to the use of such a name. As a matter of fact the more expressive 'Father in Heaven' took the place of the older and shorter שמים. It is true that Antigonos of Soko[37] still speaks of fear of Heaven (מורא שמים), which phrase is repeated by others and changed later in יראת שמים, yet he most probably meant, 'the fear of the Father in Heaven'. In connexion with sanctifying or profaning God's name, we find always חלול שם שמים or מקדש שם שמים. Thus in the sayings of Shimon b. Shetach,[38] Abtaljon,[39] and many others.[40] The pious are spoken of as devoting and performing all their actions, directing all their thoughts and deeds לשם שמים.[41] The use of שם יהוה in the Bible offers the best parallel to our case. In times when the Tetragrammaton *alone*, for some reason or other, did not satisfy all the longing, could not express all the

[32] Lam. r., p. 61 A.

[33] b. Ber. 53 B; Sifre Deut., § 301, 354; Sotah, i. 31; *AbRN.* i. 38, 114.

[34] b. A. Z. 52 B; Men. 59 A; b. R. H. 55 A; Pes. Buber, 6 B, and *DEZ.*, ed. Tawrogi, p. 16.

[35] Sifre Deut., § 96; Torath Kohanim, 83 B; A. R. N. 44; pal. Sotah, i. 7; Meg. i. 6; v. also Chwolson, *Ssabier*, ii. 724.

[36] Gen. r. 1, ed. Theod., p. 12.

[37] Mekh. 53 B; Aboth i. 3; iv. 12.

[38] B. Taanith, 23 A.

[39] Aboth i. 11.

[40] v. Pes. 57 A, Ker. 28 A: וששכר איש כפר ברקאי שמכבד את עצמו ומחלל קדשי שמים; v. J. Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 233; B. M. K. 17 A; R. Ilai: אם רואה אדם שיצרו מתגבר עליו ילך וכו' ואל יתחלל שם שמים R. Simon b. Johai, Gen. r. 1. 17 and Paralls., Mekh. 37 B.

[41] Tos. B. K. ch. 8; b. Taan. 23 A; Sifre Deut., § 42; pal. Sotah, 9. 10.

religious thoughts, of men, because it might lead to misunderstanding, then the Tetragrammaton had to be combined with שם. The same process took place when שמים alone became too familiar among Jews and Gentiles alike, and could not express without a prefixed שם the meaning attached to it. Many instances show that שמים was used in the sense of the other names, e.g. גבוה, מעלה, רומו של עולם, e.g. in sayings מן השמים, or שמים 'coming from above', 'from High', and afterwards 'the Highest', as in the saying of R. Simon b. Johai and others.[42]

(91) תוקפיהון דישראל

'The Strength of Israel.' R. Tanhum b. Hanilai translates אביר ישראל, Isa. 1. 24, by תוקפיהון דישראל. Targum has תקיפא דישראל.[43] According to a legend the angels call God: הא תקיף הא תקיף, הא אלהא.[44] A Boraita of Bar Kappara translates: וכעצם השמים לטהר (Exod. 24. 10) by כתקיף שמיא.[45]

[42] v. b. A. Z., 18 A; Eccles. r. 1. 8, 9. 7; Sifre Num., § 78; b. Sabb. 157 B; b. Ber. 58 A; B. B. 91 B; Eccles. r. 11. 8.

[43] Pes. B. 123 A. [44] Pes. B. 152 A; Lev. r. 29. 3.

[45] pal. Sukka, iv. 3; cf. Lev. r. 23. 8.

IV.

The Sources.

(1) The *Mishna* is the oldest post-biblical literary work which we can consult for our investigation. As a halachic compilation it does not offer as much material for the treatment of our subject as we would desire, yet the little we can glean from its pages is of decisive value and an eloquent witness for the history of God's name in Judaism. Here we find confirmed and proved, the first time, the great and important development through which Judaism passed during the first three centuries. The fact that the name הקדוש ב׳ה is so very rare in the original portions of the Mishna, must give rise to serious reflection. We will prove that in the original Tannaitic sayings the word הקב׳ה either does not occur at all, or, if it occurs it is a late addition or alteration. We put our material chronologically to enable students to judge for themselves. The importance of this theory for the distinction between the earlier parts and the later Amoraic additions need not be specially emphasized. The views about the oldest and more recent parts of the Mishna are still fluctuating. Certain portions can, with some certainty, be ascribed to the periods prior to the destruction of the second Temple. Our investigation will show how far these results can be relied upon. Further, we gain by this method a standard by which to test the genuineness of the oldest material in the Mishna.

We start with *Antigonos, the man of Sokho.* He added to his famous saying, which deals with man's relation to his Maker, the very significant admonition, 'Let there be

the fear of Heaven upon you.'[1] Man should see in God a master, who has to be served for His own sake, without expecting a reward. Yet this lack of reward must not lead to the abrogation of duties. The fear of Heaven (God) should urge man to discharge his duties towards his Master. *Abtaljon* enjoined his contemporaries to avoid the profanation of the name of Heaven.[2] The predecessor of Abtaljon, *Simon b. Shetach*, uses the term המקום, and his contemporary, *Honi*, the circle drawer, expresses the relation of God to man in the form of a father to his son, which is shared fully by Simon b. Shetach. The fatherhood of God seems to both of them a well-established and known conception of their theology.[3] *R. Johanan b. Zakkai* preached that Job did not serve God from love, but fear. This teacher used the term המקום.[4] *R. Joshua b. Hyrkanos* proved that Job served המקום in love.[5] Another pupil of R. Johanan, *R. Joshua b. Hananya*[6] concludes, after reviewing the sad events which passed since the destruction of the Temple, like *R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos*, with the saying: 'We have none to rely on besides our *Father in Heaven*' (אבינו שבשמים).[7] In another prayer of R. Joshua we find: 'Help, O God (השם).[8] *R. Gamaliel II* speaks of the Kingdom of Heaven (מלכות שמים),[9] of המקום,[10] and אלוה,[11] when referring to the character of the gods generally. *Akabja b. Mehalalel*, who lived before the destruction of the second Temple,[12] uses המקום and מלך מלכי המלכים הקב׳ה. Yet the text is not firmly established.[13] *R. Dosa b. Hyrkanos* speaks in a

[1] Aboth i. 3: ויהי מורא שמים עליכם; A. R. N. i. 5 adds: כדי שיהיה שברכם כפול לעתיד לבא.

[2] Aboth i. 11; the passage is omitted in A. R. N. [3] Taanith ii. 8.

[4] Sotah v. 5. [5] Ib. v. 4. [6] v. also ib. v. 5.

[7] Sotah ix. 20, 21.

[8] Originally the Tetragrammaton, Berakhoth iv. 4.

[9] Ber. ii. 5. [10] Pes. x. 5: שפסח המקום.

[11] Ab. Zar. iii. 4. [12] Ed. v. 6.

[13] So Aboth iii. 1; Tanh. Gen. Buber, p. 120, shows clearly that the original reading was המקום ב׳ה; Tanh. reads: בוראך זה הקב׳ה בוראך למקום שאתה עתיד ליתן דין וחשבון. The word למקום gives no sense.

prayer for the New Year's Day of אלהינו ה׳,[14] likewise *R. Akiba* in a prayer, אלהינו יי[15]; otherwise this teacher uses the term, 'Your Father in Heaven' אביכם שבשמים[16] and המקום.[17] *R. Eleazar b. Azarja* has המקום[18] and שמים.[19] *R. Tarphon* likes to describe God as a בעל הבית and בעל מלאכה.[20] God is a landlord who urges the lazy workmen to finish their work, for which they are paid very well. Or, God is like a trustworthy employer, who rewards those who work for their master. The same term and aspect is in R. Eleazar's teaching. He admonishes the diligent study of the Torah in order to be able to reply to the Epicureans, and to be perfectly aware, before whom one toils and who the employer is, who will faithfully pay his reward.[21] Hanina b. Dosa[22] speaks of מקום. The saying attributed to R. Hananja b. Taradjon has הקב׳ה.[23] The first part of the sentence ascribed to R. Hananja uses the term שכינה for God. The later part of the Mishna is altogether suspicious. A Geniza fragment has the reading: מן אפילו אחד, שיושב ושונה מעלה עליו הכתוב כאלו קיים כל התורה כולה שנ׳ ישב בדד וידם כי נטל עליו.[24] We have here the third instance showing that the term הקב׳ה is a later insertion or addition.

The Mishna further furnishes us with some scanty material as to the terms used by the great teachers after the Bar-Kokhba period. We have mentioned already once *R. Judah b. Ilai's* version of the saying in the Temple on

Originally it was בוראך המקום, later on הקב׳ה was put; v. also pal. Sotah, 18 A, where the sentence is quoted with the interpretation of R. Levi: בוראך לפני מי שאתה עתיד ליתן דין וחשבון; v. also Lev. r. 18. 1; Eccles. r. 12. 1: בוראך זה מלך מלכי מלכים הקב׳ה. It is obvious that the sentence was altered in the third century.

[14] Erubin iii. 9. [15] Pes. x. 6.

[16] Yoma x. 9. The continuation אף הקב׳ה מטהר את ישראל is a later gloss provided by some Amora of the third century for a purpose, namely that the treatise should not conclude with the word את הטמאים.

[17] Aboth iii. 15. [18] Yoma x. 9.

[19] Yadaim iv. 3. [20] Aboth ii. 15, 16.

[21] Ib. ii. 14; v. also ch. vi. 4. [22] Ib. iii. 11. [23] Ib. iii. 2.

[24] A similar text was known to R. Joseph Ashkenazy; v. מלאכת שלמה in בית הבחירה, Wien, 1854, 15 A.

the Feast of the Water-drawing.[25] *R. Meir* has the terms שכינה[26] and מקום.[27] In the first instance it is asserted that God is grieved on account of the violent death caused to the wicked: how much more when inflicted upon the righteous. *R Simon b. Johai* speaks of מקום,[28] but also of הקב׳ה.[29] Similarly in the well-known saying of *R. Hananja b. Akasja*, רצה הקב׳ה לזכות את ישראל, the term cannot be original, since edd. and MSS. preserved the older form המקום. No doubt, owing to the liturgical use of the saying the newer form displaced the older one.[30] R. Gamaliel, the son of R. Judah I, admonishes those who are engaged in communal work, to work for the name of Heaven (לשם שמים).[31] R. Jose, the priest said before this teacher: 'All thy works shall be for the name of Heaven' (לשם שמים).[32] This was a high degree of piety. R. Johanan b. Baroka says: 'He who profanes (כל המחלל שם שמים the name of Heaven privately will be punished publicly.' As to the profanation of the Name there is no difference between a presumptuous and an unconscious action.[33] R. Johanan, the סנדלר, distinguishes between gatherings לשם שמים and שלא לשם שמים,[34] and R. Eleazar b. Shamua enjoins: 'Fear thy master, as thou fearest Heaven.[35] Judah b. Tema speaks of God as 'thy Father in Heaven', whose will has to be done with the strength of a leopard, the lightness of an eagle, swiftness of a deer, and the force of a lion.[36]

Finally we have to refer to the sayings of R. Joshua b. Levi and R. Simon b. Halafta, who belong to the post-Tannaitic period, which contain already the name of הקב׳ה.[37]

[25] v. above, p. 31.
[26] Sanh. vi. 5.
[27] Ib., and Aboth vi. 6.
[28] Aboth ii. 13.
[29] Sanh. x. 6; v. however Sifre Deut., § 95, where אמר הקב׳ה is *not to be found*.
[30] Maccoth iii. 16.
[31] Aboth ii. 2.
[32] Aboth ii. 12.
[33] Aboth iv. 4.
[34] Aboth iv. 11.
[35] Aboth iv. 12.
[36] Aboth v. 20.
[37] Ukazin iii. 12.

This list, which may appear technical and not in the least attractive, is very instructive indeed. For we learn that in the time of the Mishna the name הקדוש ברוך הוא was not commonly used by the Tannaim. It must have been introduced for some reason or other in the generation immediately after the redaction of the Mishna. This can be especially proved from the saying of R. Eleazar ha-Kappar, who enumerates God's names and attributes. In his words the names of God are: אל (God), יוצר (the Former), בורא (the Creator), המבין (the Omniscient, cf. Ps. 33. 15), דיין (the Judge), עד (Witness), בעל דין (Accuser).[38] The term הקב׳ה is not given, although the sentence concludes with: לפני מלך מלכי המלכים הקב׳ה. It is quite likely that הקב׳ז stands here also for המקום.[39] Our theory is corroborated by the sayings in the Mishna, which are cited without the special names of their authors. Ber. vi, reports that the 'Early Hasidim' waited a short while before starting their prayers in order 'to prepare their heart to God' (כדי שיכוונו לבם למקום).[40] Shek. iii. 2 we read: לפי שאדם צריך לצאת ידי הבריות בדרך שצריך לצאת ידי המקום; Sotah. i. 6: אתם באים בנצחונו המקום נוולה and המקום גילה; Sanh. viii. 1: של מקום. In one Mishna we have הקב׳ה and המקום in one and the same sentence: מי לנו גדול ממשה שלא נתעסק בו אלא הקב׳ה — אלא שכל הצדיקים שהמקום מאספן, yet Edd. and MSS. read in both cases המקום. We further notice very frequently that when the name המקום occurs twice in a saying, the first or the second was altered by the copyists in הקב׳ה. We find further the term הקב׳ה twice in Sanh. iv. 5. The whole passage contains a refutation of the Minim, who say that there are two powers in Heaven: ולהניד גדולתו של הקב׳ה שאדם טובע כמה מטבעות בחותם אחד, וכולן דומין זה לזה: ומלך מלכי המלכים הקב׳ה. The passage is quoted in Seder Elijahu r.,

[38] Aboth iv. 22.

[39] According to A. R. N., 2 rec., ch. 34, the saying belongs to Eliezer, the son of Eleazar ha-Kappar, who flourished in the days of Rabbi, when the term became already known.

[40] v. Men. xiii. 11: ובלבד שיכוון אדם את דעתו לשמים.

ch. i, ed. Friedmann, p. 10, with שנו חכמים במשנה, and reading in both cases ממ״ה הקב״ה. One is permitted to doubt whether the whole of דבר אחר seems an integral part of the Mishna. It is a later addition.[41] Similar is the case with M. Ned. iii. 6. The last Mishna of this chapter is introduced by דבר אחר and contains a sentence: שאילמלא היא לא ברא הקב״ה. Here, again, we have a later addition to the Mishna. Yet, while in the first case we are forced to work with a hypothesis, here we have something to rely on. The Palestinian Mishna[42] marks this Mishna as a later interpolation by the word תוספה 'addition'. Most of the passages with הקב״ה were met with in the Aboth, the text of which was specially apt to be altered. We have here to refer to passages in the sixth chapter, which are external Mishnajoth, and, therefore, cannot upset our theory; rather do they confirm it.[43]

Next to מקום the most usual term is שמים. It is used in the term: עול מלכות שמים 'the yoke of the heavenly kingdom', or 'the yoke of Heaven', (עול שמים)[44] 'the Father in Heaven',[45] especially with reference to vows and sanctification,[46] or punishment by Heaven.[47] In prayers,[48] in oaths,[49] the Biblical names were used, אלהים and אלוה to signify

[41] Other instances of דבר אחר in the Mishna are Ber. ix. 5; v. Sifre Deut., § 32, R. Jacob, Yalkut reads R. Akiba; v. Tosefta Sanh. viii. 5.

[42] מתניתא רבי מערבא, ed. W. H. Lowe, Cambridge, 1883, p. 85 B, l. 25.

[43] Aboth vi. 10: ג׳ קנינים קנה לו הקב״ה; v., further on, Mekh., p. 43 A, and vi. 11: כל מה שברא הקב״ה לכבודו בראו.

[44] Ber. ii. 2; v. R. Joshua b. Korha.

[45] Kel. iv. 8; v. R. Simon b. Eleazar; cf. Sifra, p. 78 B; M. R. H. iii. 9. בל זמן שישראל מתכלין כלפי מעלה ומשעבדין את לבן לאביהן שבשמים, twice, Sotah iv. 24; Sanh. vii. 10 read אבינו שבשמים instead of אלהינו שבשמים?

[46] Ned. i. 4, once, שמים; v. ע״ז, then v. כהנים, iv. 3; v. ix. 3; Sheb. iv. 13.

[47] Zeb. iv. 13; Judah ha Temani: כרת בידי שמים; Sanh. xi. 5: מיתתו בידי שמים; v. בידי אדם.

[48] Ber. vii. 7.

[49] Sheb. iv. 13.

idols or gods.[50] In many cases the noun השם substituted the divine name. Finally we find the old term קונה.[51] We are entitled to draw the deduction that המקום was the most usual term in the period of the Tannaim. The term אב שבשמים 'Father in Heaven', enjoyed the same popularity. 'Heaven', שמים and 'High' גבוה, were already somewhat antiquated; הקב'ה not yet used. We have, fortunately, other Tannaitic sources which may prove or disprove our contention. We turn, therefore, to the Tosefta, then to the Tannaitic Midrashim, and finally to the fragments of Tannaitic works preserved in the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmud.[51a]

(2) The second source at our disposal is the *Tosefta*. This work contains more Haggadic material than our Mishna, therefore, it offers more material for our investigation. Yet, owing to the fact that the redaction of the Tosefta must be put in the Amoraic period, the change of the name המקום into הקב'ה is more clearly discerned than in the Mishna. We will treat first the passages in which הקב'ה occurs. They are:

(*a*) ii. 15: שכשברא הקב'ה את האדם לא בראו ערום. The whole sentence introduced by the words אף על פי שאמרו is an Amoraic tradition based on an older Tannaitic exposition of Job 38. 9 by R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, R. Joshua b. Hananja, and R. Akiba. Nakedness was condemned by the Rabbis. Sifre Deut., § 320, might have been the source of the Tosefta. There we read: בלא עם אלו הבאים מברבריא ומטונס וממורטניא שמהלכין ערומים בשוק אין לך אדם בזוי ופגום בעולם אלא המהלך ערום בשוק.[52] Just as the Sifre singles out those of Barbary, Tunis, and Mauretania as walking naked on the market squares, so Philostratus of Tyre, in

[50] Ber. ix. 4, v. above, pp. 68–9; Yoma iii. 8, iv. 2, vi. 2; Sanh. vi. 4, vii. 5.

[51] Hag. ii. 1; Kid. iv. 13; R. Simon b. Eleazar.

[51a] v. also A. Spanier, 'Die Gottesbezeichnungen המקום und הקדוש ברוך הוא in der frühtalmudischen Literatur, in *MGWJ.* 66, 1922, pp. 309–314.

[52] T. r.: אין שבחו של אדם להיות יושב ערום.

the Life of Apollonius of Tyana points to the wise men of Ethiopia (Photius, Library, i. 37) and Hippolytus (Ref. i. 21), to the Brahmans, who pass their life naked. The Book of Jub. (i. 31) also enjoins that people should not uncover themselves as the Gentiles do.[53] This passage of the Sifre is quoted in the Babylonian Talmud, where we read: במתניתא תנא אלו אנשי ברבריא ואנשי מרטנאי שמהלכין ערומים בשוק שאין לך משוקץ ומתועב לפני המקום יותר ממי.[54] We are entitled to assume that המקום was the original rendering in our text as well.

(*b*) Peah i. 4, we read: מחשבה טובה המקום מצרפה למעשה, מחשבה רעה אין המקום מצרפה למעשה 'A good thought is considered by God as an accomplished action—good deed. A bad thought, plan, is not regarded as an action'. The teaching is based on Ps. 66. 18, 'If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me.' The teaching was, however, objected to on account of Jer. 6. 19, 'Behold, I will bring evil, the fruit of their *thoughts*', and amended thus: 'A good thought, which does good, God (המקום) considers as a deed, but a thought which does no good, God (הקב"ה) does not regard it as a deed'. Here we may assume that all the four names were originally המקום, or that the alteration of the doctrine is of Amoraic origin. The Tannaitic origin of the teaching is confirmed by the Mekhilta[55]: ויעשו, וכי כבר עשו אלא משקיבלו עליהם לעשות מעלה עליהם כאילו עשו. Old

[53] About nakedness in Jewish literature; v. also M. Abba Gorion, 13; Pirke R. El. ch. 49; Td. E. 93 B; M. Ps. B. 523. In the rites of various people, Weinhold, *Abhandlung. der Berl. Ak.*, 1896, 30, *ZdVsfVK.* 21, 1911, 305; Samter, *Geburt, Hochzeit und Tod.*, 109 f.; W. A. Müller, *Nacktheit und Entblössung in altorient. u. altgr. Kunst. Diss.*, Leipzig, 1906; Fehrle, E., *Kultische Keuschheit*, p. 11, and 62. 6 in the Lupercalia *ARW.* 1910, 491; Wensinck, *Some Semitic Rites*, p. 98.

[54] b. Jeb. 63 B; Yalkut 945, v. מברברי ומבריטניא; Pes. z. only, מברבריאה. About the Barbarians in the Haggada, v. Gen. r. 75. 9; R. Hama b. Hanina; Gen. r. 23. 11; R. Hanina; M. Zutta, p. 90; R. Judah; Gen. r. 42. 4; R. Samuel b. Nahmani, Esther r. 39; R. Levi; Exod. r. 18. 6; Jel. Num. 7 A; Midr. Abba Gorion, p. 20; M. Ps. 215; Pes. B. 48 A. Nearly all of these references date back to the third century, when the Roman Empire was trembling for fear of the Barbarians.

[55] p. 13 A.

but Yoma 29a; Pesekta Rabbati 124b; Lev. R. 23.11, Num. 1.8.5

witnesses read: והעלה עליהם המקום כאלו עשו.[56] The doctrine is very often repeated,[57] and not without reason. Stoics taught that sin consists in intention, and not in act.[58] The Testaments teach that God takes account of intentions and motives even for evil. Sins of the flesh can be committed in thoughts.[59] The Pastor Hermas threatens also those who sin in thought.[60] The earlier Tannaitic Haggada opposed this view, yet the alteration agreed with the teaching of the external literature. This dogmatic change bears out our theory, that המקום represents the older, הקב"ה the younger stratum of the saying.

(*c*) Demai v. 18: לפיכך הקב"ה מביא עליהם שלש פורענות כנגד שלש עבירות. Here the Palestinian Talmud, Demai vi. 2, supplies us with the reading: המקום מביא עליהן ג' פורענות.

(*d*) Shabb. vii. 25. *R. Simon b. Gamaliel* praises the Emorites: אין לך בכל העממין מתון יותר מן האמורי שכן האמינו בהקב"ה וגלו לאפריקא ונתן להם המקום ארץ יפה כארצם. Here again the Palestinian Talmud enables us to establish the right text. Jer. Shebiit vi. 1, quotes a saying by R. Samuel b. Nahmani, v. Tosafoth Gittin 46 A, *s. v.* ויבין, where the sentence occurs: נדנשי פינה והאמין לו להקב"ה והלך לאפריקי. Therefore the original sentence of R. Simon b.

[56] Rashi, Yalkut.

[57] v. b. Ber. 6 A; *R. Ashi* (v. R. Assi): חשב אדם לעשות מצוה ונאנס ולא עשאה מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו עשאה; b. Shabb. 63 A, the same, in the name of R. Ami: מעלה עליו הכתוב; b. Kid. 40 A; R. Assi; after this our Boraita is quoted; v. also p. 39 B: מחשבה רעה אין הקב"ה מצרפה למעשה שנ' און אם ראיתי, with the alteration, which reads: מחשבה שעושה פרי הקב"ה מצרפה למעשה מחשבה שאין בה פרי אין הקב"ה מצרפה. Jer. Peah., i. 1, the Boraita is quoted: מחשבה טובה המקום מצרפה למעשה מחשבה רעה אין המקום מצרפה למ'. It seems that our Tosefta is based on the Pal. Talmud, using the commentary given thereon. R. Levi expresses this view with reference to the sacrifice of Isaac, Gen. r. 55. 5: ביצחק אעפ"י שלא נעשה מעשה קבלו כגומר מעשה; v. Theodor, p. 588; Ag. Ber., p. 51: אין הק' דן אלא לפי המחשבות. On further developments of this thought v. *Midrash Haseroth*, London, 1917, p. 19, note 86.

[58] Seneca, *de Benef.* 5, 14, and 19; Ep. Mor. 95.

[59] Test. Iudah vii. 2; Joseph ix. 2; v. also Naph. ii. 9; Gad v. 3.

[60] i. 8; v. also Wisdom Sol. iii. 15.

Gamaliel read: אין לך בכל העממין מתון יותר מן האמורי ונתן להם המקום ארץ יפה כארצם. Later copyists or teachers inserted the words of R. Samuel b. Nahmani as a comment.

(*e*) Shek. i. 6: אף כך אמר הקב״ה יתמשכנו ישראל על שקליהם T. W. and T. A. read המקום. Similar evidence can be brought forward from Edd. and MSS. for מקום instead of הקב״ה, being the original reading in Yoma ii. 5: אמרו לא שלא יהו עושין כן לע״ז ברא הקב״ה את עולמו אלא לכבודו[61]; further: כדרך שעושין להקב״ה, Sotah iii. 7,[62] iii. 9, iii. 19, vii. 4, viii. 6, x. 5.

(*f*) Yoma ii. 7, says Simon b. Loga to R. Akiba: אף אמר לו על הכבוד שהקב״ה עתיד לשמח את בנין המתוקן לצדיקים לע״ל, where the name is altogether omitted and the whole sentence is put in a less anthropomorphic form. Sotah vii. 4, we find in W. and T. A. the reading שכשהשביע משה instead of וכן מצינו שכשהשביע הקב״ה את ישראל בערבות מואב. Sanh. viii. 9: זה מלך מלכי המלכים הקב״ה שברא עולמו בשבועה, yet Sanh. viii. 5 we find the form: למה נברא יחידי להגיד גדולתו של מלך מלכי המלכים ברוך הוא, v. Mishna Sanh. iv. 5. The original form was מלך מלכי המלכים 'the King of kings', which was later on supplemented by הקב״ה.

(*g*) Erakhin i. 10: אמר להן הקב״ה לעננ כבוד רבצו טל לפני בני והקב״ה מרביץ לפניהם טללים .... Comparing the sentence in the Tosefta with R. Joshua b. Levi's saying in the T. and M. we are justified in seeing in the same a teaching of this Amora, or an older sentence reshaped by the teacher of the third century.[63]

We must bear in mind a few facts resulting out of this material. That most of these instances belong to the anonymous Haggadah, and even here we were able to show the original reading מקום. Where this proof could not be established, we have furnished proofs for the later date, the post-Tannaitic origin of the doctrines. The well-known Tannaim use the older names for God, e.g. מקום or שמים.

[61] v. above, M. Aboth vi. 11, and Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits*, p. 115 f.

[62] v. Mekh. 35 B.

[63] v. Shabb. 88 B; Mekh. 71 B.

The former is to be met with in the majority of sayings and sentences: R. Johanan b. Zakkai,[64] his pupils, R. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos,[65] and R. Joshua b. Hananja.[66] R. Akiba considers every one favoured by God (המקום), who is popular with man.[67] R. Ishmael derives the law that the books of the heretics may not be saved from fire on Sabbath by a comparison with the law of the suspected woman. In the latter God (המקום) commands the blotting out of His name, in order to make peace between husband and wife; how much more in this case! These books throw enmity, jealousy, and strife between Israel and their Father in Heaven.[68] Ben Azzai says: אין שכחה לפני המקום.[69] 'There is no forgetfulness before God.' R. Meir,[70] R. Jose b. Halafta,[71] R. Simon b. Johai,[72] R. Menahem b. Jose,[73] and R. Simon b. Eleazar[74] use the same term.[75] The anonymous Haggada in the Tosefta uses throughout המקום.[76]

[64] B. K. vii. 10: בוא וראה כמה חם המקום על כבוד הבריות.

[65] Yoma iv. 17: כך יהיו איבי המקום; Sanh. xiv. 3: אלא כך אמר המקום הריני נותן אותם לרחמים ומטיל אהבתי בלבם.

[66] Sanh. xiii. 6: שאין המקום מניח להן מצוה.

[67] Ber. iii. 4: כל שרוח הבריות נוחה הימנו רוח המקום נוחה הימנו אבל כל שאין וכו'; v. Aboth iii. 10, attributed to R. Haninah b. Dosa, missing A. N., ch. 29; v. above, p. 110; Ed. i. 14: אע"פ שהימים והלילות כחוט השערה לפני המקום.

[68] Shabb. 13. 5.

[69] Yoma ii. 7.

[70] Sanh. viii. 6: שינה המקום מראה פנים דעת וקול; Men. vii. 9: בזמן שישראל ברצון לפני המקום כבנים שמתפרנסים מאביהם.

[71] Sotah vii. 1.

[72] Sanh. xiv. 4.

[73] Sanh. xiii. 6.

[74] Sanh. xiv. 10: כשם ששמחה לפני המקום בקיומן של צדיקים כך שמחה לפני המקום באבדן של רשעים; Sotah vi. 7.

[75] Other instances: *Hasid*, Peah iii. 8: כל מצוה שבתורה נתן לנו המקום אונדם; לדעתינו זו שלא לדעתינו שאילו עשינו ברצון לפני המקום *ben Levi*, Yoma ii. 8; *Hasid*, Taan. iii: אבל בטוחין אנו שאין המקום מביא מבול לעולם; R. Eleazar, the son of R. Jose, the Galilean; Sanh. i. 2; R. Eleazar, Sotah ii. 3.

[76] Ber. iii. 77: שאין גבהות לפני המקום; iv. 16: וקידש שמו של מקום; iii. 16: סומא ומי שאין יכול לכוין את הרוחות מכוונין לבם לפני המקום; T. W. reads instead of המקום = אביהן שבשמים; T. B.: אבינו שבשמים;

We have to enumerate here, also, the terms which contain the ideas of God's kingship, as expressed by Rabbi (Ber. ii. 1), corresponding to R. Joshua b. Korha's 'Kingdom of Heaven'. The 'Fatherhood of God' is to be found several times in the sayings of R. Johanan b. Zakkai [77] and R. Eleazar b. Jose.[78] The use of שמים is in the Tosefta similar to that in the Mishna.[79] In prayers the Biblical names of God, יי אלהינו, are repeated.[80] Speaking of strange deities אלוה is used.[81]

We observe that some of the Psalms and the majority

Pal. למעלן. We saw above, p. 112, that כיון לבו occurs with מקום as well as with שמים. Yoma ii. 7: כדרך שעושין לפני המקום; R. H. ii. 3: ללמדך שבית דינו של ירובעל גדול לפני המקום כב׳׳ד של משה; Sotah, iii. 9, 12, 13, 14, 18; v. 12; x. 3, 4, 5; Kid. v. 17, 21; B. K. vii. 7; A. Z. iv. 5; Men. xiii. 22.

[77] Hag. ii. 10: בכבוד אבינו שבשמים (twice); B. K. vii. 6; v. also vii. 7; v. also R. Ishmael, above, to Shabb. xiii. 5; R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, Hullin, ii. 24.

[78] Peah iv. 20: מנין שהצדקה וגמילות חסדים פרקליט גדול ושלום בין ישר׳ לאביהם שבשמים.

[79] R. Akiba, Shek. ii. 1: הטוב בעיני שמים והישר בעיני האדם; Yoma ii. 8: שנתחלל שם; v. 8: הם ביקשו להרבות כבודם ולמעט כבוד שמים; Sotah v. 12: שם שמים נתחלל and השמים ביני לבינך; v. also vi. 7, xiv. 4: עול מלכות שמים, v. ופרקו מהם עול שמים; B. K. vi. 16, ix. 31: דינו מסור לשמים; B. K. vii. 5; R. Johanan b. Zakkai, like Sotah xiv. 4; B. K. viii. 13: אמרו עליו על ר׳ יהודה בן בבא שהיו כל מעשיו לשם שמים, v. above, p. 111; Sheb. iii. 1–3: אין מן השמים מוחלין לו עד שישלמו; Kor. ii. 7; כך כל המכנים ביריה אחת תחת כנפי השמים; Nid. v. 16: הקדיש קרדום אחד לשמים.

[80] For instance Ber. iii. 5: אחרים אומרים צורכי עמך מרובים ודעתן קצרה יהי רצון מלפניך יי אלהינו שתתן לכל אחד ואחד וכו׳; ib., R. Eleazar b. Zadok, in the name of his father: מאהבתך יי אלהינו שאהבת את ישראל עמך . . . . . נתת לנו יי אלהינו את יום השביעי הגדול וכו׳; ib. vii. 2: יהי רצון מלפניך יי אלהינו שתיעקר עבודה זרה; ib. vii. 16 f., Ben Azzai: מודה אני לפניך יי אלהי and יהי רצון מלפניך יי אלהינו.

[81] Ab. Zara v. 6: את שנוהג לשום אלוה אסור ואת שאינו נוהג בו לשום אלוה מותר; iv. 4: כל זמן שאתם בארץ כנען הריני לכם לאלוה באין אתם בארץ כנען כביכול איני לכם לאלוה.

of the Apocryphal writings give some preference to the name עליון 'the Highest', 'Most High'. The Tosefta preserves the same as גבוה, in opposition to הדיוט, or uses the word עליון itself. The first is to be found [82] in a dispute between the Schools of Shammai and Hillel. The latter in a saying of R. Johanan b. Zakkai,[83] where the name קונה, again a very old term, is also mentioned.[84] Other names, either familiar to us from the Mishna or new ones, are: (1) בורא, (2) בעל הבית, (3) דיין, (4) מי שאמר והיה העולם, (5) יודע מחשבות, (6) רחמן, (7) רוח הקודש, (8) הקודש, (9) שבינה and (10) השם. The first one, בורא, 'the Creator', is referred to in the dialogue between the philosopher and R. Reuben, in Tiberias, where the latter says: זה הכופר במי שבראו,[85] and Sotah vii. 12: אל אחד בראן 'one God created them all'. The second, בעל הבית, is known from the Mishna; here it is derived from a saying of Ben Zoma.[86] The third is used by R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos and R. Meir.[87] The fourth by Simeon b. Shetach.[88] The fifth by R. Meir [89] and R. Jose b. Halafta.[90] קודש, Taan. ii. 10, occurs only once in the saying: מפי הקודש אני עולה. This term is unique in the Tosefta, and will be discussed in connexion with the parallels in the Tannaitic Midrash. רוח הקודש stands sometimes for God, likewise שבינה and השם. The name רחמן 'All-Merciful', is mentioned by R. Judah b. Ilai in the name of R. Gamaliel II: 'When thou art merciful, the All-Merciful will be merciful to thee' (B. K. viii. 13). B. Shabb. 151 B, quotes this saying by R. Gamaliel b. Rabbi כל המרחם על הבריות מרחמין עליו מן השמים, שאינו מרחם על הבריות אין מרחמין עליו מן השמים. The same saying is mentioned in Sifre Deut., § 96: כל זמן שאתה מרחם על הבריות מרחמים עליך מן השמים. Midr. Tannaim, 69, does not supply the teacher's name, and reads: אם ריחמת מרחמין עליך ואם לאו אין מרחמין עליך.[91]

[82] Hag. ii. 10; Erakhin iv. 32; R. Judah b. Batyra.
[83] B. K. vii. 2.
[84] v. also Ber. vi. 1: אלא בכבוד קונהו.
[85] Sheb. iii. 6.
[86] Ber. vii. 2.
[87] Hullin ii. 24, and Ber. vii. 1.
[88] Sanh. viii. 3.
[89] B. K. vii. 10.
[90] B. M. vi. 17.
[91] v. also Fragment, ed. Schechter, *JQR.*, 1904, p. 699; M. T., p. 41.

The Tosefta is a faithful witness that המקום was the name used by the Tannaim; הקב"ה is a later substitute for המקום, or of Amoraic origin altogether. Half-a-dozen or so passages with הקב"ה have been dealt with above, and it was shown that parallels offer instead of this name המקום, or that some can be classified with the Haggada of the Amoraim. If the latter found a place in the Mishna, no wonder that the same happened in the Tosefta. On the whole, however, the old tradition that these works, Mishna and Tosefta, were (apart from minor glosses) editorially finished in the period of the Tannaim, is well established. The final redaction might have taken place in the School of R. Joshua b. Levi, who, as we saw, was closely connected with the problem of pronouncing the name of God and the alteration of המקום into הקב"ה.

(3) Our third source is the Mekhilta on Exodus. Two books with the title of Mekhilta are now in our hands. One belongs to the School of R. Ishmael, the other to that of R. Akiba. Although we are able to establish many theological differences between the two schools, we have no traces of different treatment accorded to the divine names in these schools. To a large extent both Mekhiltas cover the same ground, therefore enable us to verify the proper readings. We find that in most of the passages of our text of the Mekhilta, where הקב"ה occurs, parallel passages, or Mekhilta of Rabbi Simon b. Johai, preserve the reading המקום or מי שאמר והיה העולם. It confirms the result we gained from the previous sources, Mishna and Tosefta, that הקב"ה was not known as a name of God to the teachers of the Tannaitic period. The Mekhilta offers, owing to its wealth of Haggada, more material for our observations. We propose to give an account of it by grouping first of all the passages containing the name אב שבשמים, expressing 'the Fatherhood of God'. Secondly, the terms שמים 'Heaven', מי שאמר והיה העולם 'the Creator', גבורה 'All-Powerful', מקום and הקב"ה.

In the Mekhilta the term אב שבשמים is found five times.

P. 3 A: אחת לל' יום מגביהים עיניהם לאביהם שבשמים. The Talmud quotes a similar passage as תנא דבי ר' ישמעאל,[92] saying: אלמלא זכו ישראל אלא להקביל פני אביהן שבשמים כל חדש וחדש דיים, אחדים אומרים היו ישראל מתחננים ומתפללין לפני אביהם שבשמים כבן שהוא מתחנן לפני אביו וכתלמיד שמתגדר לפני רבו כך היו ישראל מתחננין ומתגדרים לפני אביהן שבשמים ואומרים לפניו רבש"ע חטאנו לפניך. In the Mekh. of R. S. b. J.[93] the passage reads: באותה שעה היו ישראל מתחננים ומתגרים לפני אביהם שבשמים כבן שמתחטא לפני אביו כתלמיד שמתגרה לפני רבו אמרו לפניו רבש"ע חטאנו שנתרעמנו אל המים. A Geniza fragment[94] preserved also the reading מתחטים instead of מתחננים.[95] The phrase is similar to that used in the story of Honi.[96] P. 56 A, *R. Joshua b. Hananja* says: כשבא עמלק להזיק את ישראל מתחת כנפי אביהם שבשמים אמר משה לפני הקב"ה רבש"ע רשע זה בא לאבד בניך מתחת כנפיך. In the M. R. S. b. J.[97] this saying is in the name of *R. Eleazar of Modiim* in a more original form: לפי שבא לאבד את ישראל מתחת כנפי השמים אמר משה לפני המקום רבש"ע רשע זה בא לאבד את בניך מתחת השמים ס"ת שנתת להן מי יקרא בו. This text proves, for which we have many other witnesses, that שמים is an abbreviated form for אביהם שבשמים. The older term המקום was changed into the newer form הקב"ה. P. 68 B, *R. Nathan* depicts the persecutions the Jews suffered in his age. Jews were burnt for reading in the Torah, crucified for eating the Passover bread, punished with one hundred strokes for taking the Lulab, and concludes: מכות אלו גרמו לי ליאהב לאבי שבשמים. Another source[98] has besides: שעשיתי רצון אבי שבשמים. The same version is preserved in the Midrash on Psalms: על שעשיתי

[92] b. Sanh. 42 A. [93] p. 72.

[94] MS. Adler. [95] v. p. 56 for the explanation.

[96] v. b. Taanith, iii. 8, and above, p. 56, note 6. Fr. reads מתגדר; Yalk. מתגרר; H. מתגרה.

[97] p. 84. About the terms ליצלב, לישרף, and לוקה באפרגל v. S. Krauss. in הדביר, i. 5683. pp. 112, 107.

[98] Lev. r. 32. 1. Here the saying is by R. Nehemia, a contemporary of R. Nathan. Here the sins of the martyrs are the observance of Sabbath, eating the Mazzah, taking the Lulab, observing the laws of Tephillin and Zizith.

רצון אבי שבשמים.[99] P. 74 A, *R. Johanan b. Zakkai* says: ומה אם אבני מזבח שאינם לא רואות ולא שומעות ולא מדברות על שמטילות שלום בין ישראל לאביהם שבשמים אמר הקב׳ה אל תניח עליהם ברזל וכו׳. M. R. S. b. J.[100] reads שמטילות כפרה instead of שמטילות שלום. Here we have another proof for the fact that the original המקום was removed for the later הקב׳ה. The Tosefta [1] reads: אבנים שמטילות שלום בין ישראל לאביהם שבש׳ אמר המקום וכו׳, and ends על אבו׳ב שיהיו שלמים לפני המקום. The same sentence which occurs in the Mekhilta is repeated in the Sifra,[2] where we also read אמר הכתוב instead of אמר הקב׳ה.

More frequent is the use of שמים for God. P. 7 B: פסח הוא ליי שיהו כל מעשיהם לשם שמים. Sifre reads לשם המיוחד.[3] P. 53 B we read מורא רבך כמורא שמים; here surely אביך שבש׳ has to be added. The teaching is given in another place [4] in the name of R. Eleazar b. Shamua, and quoted in the Palestinian Talmud as a Mishna.[5] The Didachê [6] borrowed this teaching from the Rabbis, substituting Lord for שמים. It says: *τιμήσεις δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς κύριον*. P. 57 A: One of Jethro's names was קנז because שקנא לשמים וקנה לו תורה. Mekh. of R. S. b. J., reads שקנה העולם הבא.[7] Our explanation attributed in Sifre to R. Jose b. Halafta. The reading is is somewhat different. P. 58 B: אינו בא אלא לשום שמים, 'for the name of Heaven.' [8] R. Eleazar of Modiim uses the phrase

[99] M. Ps. 12. 5, ed. Buber, p. 108. The reading differs from that of Lev. r. מה לך לוקה בפרוגין על שעשיתי רצון אבי שבש׳. There is missing a whole sentence. Read מה לך לוקה בפרגל על שעשיתי סוכה וכו׳ על שעשיתי רצון אבא שבשמים. All sources conclude with the words of R. Nathan in the Mekhilta.

[100] p. 116. The conclusion reads בני תורה שהן כפרה לעולם על אבו׳ב. The term בן תורה is younger than תלמיד חכם.

[1] B. K. vii. 7, ed. Zuckermandl, p. 358, l. 16, v. above, p. 118.

[2] 84 A; v. also Semahoth, ch. viii, r.: יהיו שלמים לפני הקב׳ה.

[3] Deut., § 128; v. above, p. 111, note 31; Aboth ii. 12; Tos. Bk. xiv. 4.

[4] Aboth iv. 12, v. above, p. 111.

[5] Ned. 41 B; v. also Exod. r. 3. 22.

[6] ch. iv, ed. Lietzmann, Bonn, 1907, p. 6. [7] p. 86.

[8] Num., § 78. The text reads: שקנה שמים וארץ, v. MS. שקנה את השמים. On the names of Jethro, v. Exod. r. 27. 7 (seven names); Pirke

in his saying: 'God says:[9] אני הוא שאמרתי אני המקרב ולא המרחק שנ' האלי מקרוב אני נאם ה' ולא אלי מרחק אני שקרבתי את יתרו ולא רחקתיו אף אתה כשבא אדם אצלך להתגייר אינו בא אלא לשם שמים. Mekh. R. S. 67 reads for לשם שמים = להבנים תחת כנפי השכינה.[10] P. 61 B, R. Johanan b. Zakkai said, when he went to Meon Jehuda and saw a girl gathering barley under the hoofs of a horse: לא רציתם להשתעבד לשמים הרי אתם משתעבדים לפני גוים, לא רציתם לשקול בקע לגולגולת הראיתם שוקלים ט'ו שקלים במלכות אויביכם. Here לשמים has to be supplemented with מלכות, i.e. 'the Kingdom of Heaven'. P. 92 B, R. Akiba speaks of מיתה בידי שמים and בידי־אדם. The same terms occur 101 B: מה שמחה אמורה באדם בדבר הראויה לבא בידי אדם אף שמחה אמורה בשלמים דבר הראוי לבא בידי שמים.

The *third* term very frequently used in the Mekhilta is: מי שאמר והיה העולם 'He who spake, and the world was created'. We find the same about eighteen times, P. 12 A: והלא אבות ונביאים שהלכו לעשות רצונו של מי שאמר והיה העולם נהגו בדרך ארץ. P. 33 A, R. Akiba says to Pappajus: אין להשיב על דברי מי שאמר והיה העולם אלא־דן הכל באמת והכל בדין. Mekh. R. S. b. J.[11] reads the sentence: שלא להשיב על דברי מי שאמר והיה העולם שהכל בדין והכל באומר. P. 33 B: 'Great is the faith which Israel believed in' מי שאמר והיה העולם. M. R. S. b. J. reads: גדולה אמנה לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם.[12] Ib., 'He who believes in the faithful shepherd is as if he believed in מי שאמר והיה העולם. He who speaks against the faithful shepherd is as if he spoke against מי שאמר והיה העולם.[13] P. 35 A: אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא כל מה שמקלסין

R. ha Kadosh, ed. Grünhut, 7. 7; v. also B. Königsberger, in Rahmer's *Jüd. Literaturblatt*, xxiii, 1892, pp. 201 ff., 204 ff.

[9] This is a variation of the name מי שעשה את העולם, v. further on p. 135.

[10] p. 87; v. also Sifre Deut., § 305, where the name of the girl's father is given as Nakdimon b. Gorion. The teaching is different. It contains the well-known antithesis . . . . כל זמן שישראל עושין רצונו של מקום ובשאין ישראל עושין רצונו של מקום. The story is also related Midr. Lam., ed. Buber, p. 86, differently; v. also Tos. Ket. chaps. 5, 6; Ket. 66 B; Pal. Ket. 5, 11; Ab. R. N. ch. 17.

[11] p. 54; v. also the parallel, Cant. r. 1. 9.

[12] p. 54; v. Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits*, p. 175 f.

[13] M. R. S. b. J., p. 54; Num. r. 19.

מקילוסו אותו הוא יותר[14] 'An earthly king is praised. They flatter him with his strength, wisdom, wealth, goodness, justice, and faithfulness; in fact, he is weak, foolish, poor, cruel, unjust, and untrustworthy'. God (מי שאמר וה' הע') cannot be duly praised. No praise comes anywhere near to His real attributes. His wisdom (Prov. 3. 19 and Job 12, 13), wealth (Deut. 10. 14, Hag. 2. 8), lovingkindness (Exod. 34. 6, Deut. 4. 31), justice (Isa. 30. 18, Ps. 82. 1), trustworthiness (Deut. 7. 9, cp. 32. 4), beauty (Ps. 89. 6, 89. 9, 86. 8, Cant. 1. 10), and power (1 Chron. 29. 11). The Mekh. enumerates God's attributes differently: power (Deut. 10. 17, Ps. 24. 8, Isa. 42. 13, and Jer. 10. 6), wealth (Deut. 10. 14, Ps. 24. 1, 95. 8, Hag. 2. 8, Ezek. 18. 4), wisdom (Prov. 2. 6, Dan. 2. 21, Jer. 10. 7), loving-kindness (Exod. 34. 6, Deut. 4. 31, Ps. 25. 6, 145. 9, Dan. 9. 9), justice (Deut. 1. 17 and 32. 4, Ps. 82. 1), trust (Deut. 7. 9). P. 37 B: שהרי מי שאמר והיה העולם עתיד להלחם בהם. P. 38 A: אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא אני יי לא שניתי.[15] Here again we have a long list of God's attributes compared to the character of an earthly king. God's power,[16]

[14] M. R. S. b. J., p. 57. Tanh., f. 82, alters מי שאמר והיה העולם into הקב"ה. The attributes are given there in the following order: might, wealth, wisdom, mercy, justice, and trust, like Mekh.

[15] Also M. R. S. b. J. 61.

[16]

Mekh.	M. R. S. b. J.
יש גבור במדינה ועליו כל כלי זין אבל אין לו כח ולא גבורה ולא תכסים ולא מלחמה אבל הק' אינו כן יש לו כח וגבורה ותכסים ומלחמה.	Missing.

The second sentence, dealing with the same attribute in a different aspect, is preserved in both sources.

Mekh.	M. R. S. b. J.
יש גבור במדינה וכחו עליו כן מ' שנה אינו דומה לבן ס', ולא כן ס' לבן ע' אלא כל שהוא הולך כחו מתמעט אבל מי ש' וה' הע' אינו כן אלא אני יי לא שניתי.	יש גבור עומד במלחמה וכחו עליו כבן מ' שנה אבל אין דומה לבן ס' או לבן ע'.

God's strength is unchangeable.

love,[17] lovingkindness,[18] omnipresence,[19] is described, and he is the sustainer of the whole world.[20] The edition of the Mekh. reads הקב׳ה in two instances where the M. R. S. b. J. has מי שאמר והיה העולם. We may assume that the original had in all the five instances the name מי שאמר, and not הקב׳ה. P. 70 A, Rabbi says: הביט כבוד אב ואם לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם ששקל כבודן ומוראן לכבודו ולמוראו. M. R. S. b. J. (p. 110) has a similar saying in the name of R. Simon b. Johai: גדול כבוד אב ואם שהשוה הקב׳ה כבודן לכבודו ומוראן למוראו. Ib., R. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos says: גלוי וידוע לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם שאדם מכבד אמו יותר מאביו וכו׳ וגלוי וידוע לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם שאדם

[17]

Mekh.	M. R. S. b. J. 62.
יש גבור במדינה שמשקנאה וגבורה לובשתו אפי׳ אביו ואפילו אמו ואפילו קרובו הכל מכה בחימה והולך לו, אבל הקב׳ה אינו כן יי איש מלחמה שהוא נלחם במצרים שהוא מרחם על בריותיו.	יש גבור עומד ומשקנאה וגבורה לובשתו אפילו אביו ואפילו אחיו ואפי׳ קרוביו אינו מבחין אלא מכה והולך בחמה, אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן הוא עושה מלחמה וא׳ע׳פי כן ה׳ שמו רחמן הוא על כל בריותיו.

God's love is shown even in battle and punishment.

[18]

Mekh.	M. R. S. b. J.
יש גבור במדינה בשעה שהחצי יוצא מידו לא יכול להתגרה אליו אבל הקב׳ה בשאין ישראל עושין רצונו כביכול גזרה יוצאה מלפניו עשו תשובה מיד הוא מחזירה.	יש גבור וכו׳ ומשחין יוצא מידו אין יכול להתגורו אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא בשאין ישראל עושין רצונו של מקום גזרה יוצאה מלפניו, עשו תשובה הרי הוא מחזירה.

[19] This point is not in the M. R. S. b. J. in the present edition. Mekh. reads: מלך בשו׳ד יוצא למלחמה ומחנות קרובות באות ושואלות צרכיהן מלפניו אומר להן זעוף הוא למלחמה הוא יוצא לכשינצח וישוב באין אתם שואלין צרכיכם מלפניו אבל הקב׳ה אינו כן שהוא נלחם במצרים שהוא שומע צעקת כל באי העולם.

[20] Mekh.: מלך בו׳ד עומד במלחמה אינו יכול לזון ולא לספק אבסניות לכל חיילותיו והקב׳ה אינו כן אלא שהוא ילחם במצרים שהוא זן ומפרנס לכל באי העולם; P. 43 B: חביב בית המקדש לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם; likewise M. R. S. b. J. 70; v. however M., p. 44 A: חביב בהמ׳ק לפני הקב׳ה מי שאמר והיה העולם; M. R. S. b. J. has again שכשברא הקב׳ה.

מגיד הבתוב שבל מי שמחלל את מתיירא מאביו יותר מאמי. P. 70 B: השבת מעיד לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם שלא ברא עולמו לששה ימים ולא נח בשביעי וכל מי שמשמר את השבת מעיד לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם שברא עולמו לששה ימים ונח בשביעי; v. also p. 104 A. P. 72 B, Rabbi: קל וחומר לכבודו של מי ש' ו' ה'. P. 87 A, R. Ishmael: בא וראה רחמיו של מי שאמר והיה העולם על בשר ודם שאדם קונה את עצמו בממון מידי שמים. P. 95 B, R. Akiba said, when R. Ishmael and R. Simon were put to death by the Romans: גלוי וידוע לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם שפורענות גדולה עתידה לבא בדורינו וסילק אלו מבינותינו. The same term is given in other reports of the same event as well.[21]

The fourth name we find in the Mekhilta is גבורה, P. 26 A: לא נסעו אלא על מפי הגבורה נאמר לי שאתם בני חורין. P. 44 B: פי משה ושאר כל המסעות כולן נסעו על פי הגבורה. R. Eliezer says: לא נפנו על פי הגבורה נסעו. P. 48 A, R. Joshua b. Hananja: למדנו שהמלחמה הזאת עד שנתגלתה גבורה. P. 54 B, R. Eliezer: לא היתה אלא על פי הגבורה. P. 59 B: צא והמלך בגבורה. P. 60 A, the same. P. 66 A: מנין שהיה משיב דברים לפני הגבורה. P. 71 A, R. Akiba: ואין דבר שלא יצא מפי הגבורה ונחצב על הלוחות.

Special attention has to be paid to the fifth and sixth name of God in this Midrash. We mean the terms מקום and הקב"ה. The first is to be found about one hundred times. Yet by comparing some of the passages which have הקב"ה with other texts, we observe that מקום was displaced by the more usual הקב"ה. Or, in some instances, the sentences with הקב"ה are of a later period, as we saw similar cases in the previous Tannaitic sources. The Mekhilta offers a special object lesson in this respect.

We give first the list of those passages where Mekh. has המקום: (1) P. 2 B: וכן אתה מוצא בברוך בן נריה שהיה מתרעם לפני המקום; (2) ib.: בא וראה מה המקום משיבו; (3) ib., *R. Akiba*: מצינו שמותיהן של צדיקים והראה המקום את כולן באצבע; (4) P. 19 A: על כן נתן להם ומעשיהם גלויים למקום עד שלא נוצרו; (5) P. 23 B: והמקום עכב לה במדבר; (6) P. 24 B: המקום קבורה; (7) P. 25 A: באותה כשהמקום פורע מן האומות שמו מתגדל בעולם; (8) P. 28 B: אמר שעה הראה להם המקום תורמיות תורמיות של מה"ש; (9) P. 30 A:

[21] v. Semahoth, ch. viii.

המקום למשה, משה בני נתונים בצרה; (10) P. 30 B (five times):
וכן אתה מוצא שלא נפרע המקום מאנשי דור המבול ומאנשי סדום וכו׳
מיד אמר המקום למשה ידידי טובעים בים והים סוגר: (11) P. 31 B
אמר המקום מי שהמלכני על הים אעשהו מלך על; (12) ib.: וכו׳
אף עוברין שבמעי אמן פתחו פיהן ואמרו שירה: (13) *R. Meir*:
ישראל לפני המקום וכו׳ ולא ישראל בלבד אמרו שירה לפני המקום; (14) P. 36 B
מה עשה המקום? מרכיב את האדם על הסוס; (15) P. 37 B, *R. Simon b. Eleazar*:
כשישראל עושין רצונו של מקום אז מתגדל שמו בעולם:
כשישראל עושין רצונו של מקום הן עושין שמאל לימין: (16) P. 39 A:
ולא היו לו (לאברהם) וכשאין ישר׳ עושין רצונו וכו׳; (17) P. 27 A:
כמה עבדים אלא לכבוד המקום; (18) P. 46 A, *R. Eleazar of Modiim*:
ושם ניסה המקום את ישראל; (19) P. 47 A, *R. Simon b. Gamaliel*:
וראה כמה חביבים ישראל לפני המקום ולפי שהן חביבין
לפניו שינה עליהם מעשה בראשית; (20) P. 51 A, *R. Eleazar of Modiim*:
אמר להם המקום אם תשמרו שבת זו עתיד אני ליתן לכם
בארץ המקום ממיך ומשה מגביה ובמקום: (21) P. 52 A
שש מדות טובות; (22) P. 52 B, *R. Eleazar of Modiim*:
אחר המקום מגביה ומשה ממיך
חמקום קראו מסה ומריבה; (23) P. 56 A, the same:
ויהא המקום יחידי בעולם ותהי מלכותו לעולם ולעולמי עולמים; (24) ib.:
הנם הזה שעשה משה בגיני עשאו; (25) P. 56 B, *R. Eliezer*:
חובב שהיה חביב למקום, המקום בבסא־הכבוד שלו; (26) P. 57 A:
רעואל שהיה כריע למקום, חבר שנעשה כחבר למקום; (27) P. 58 A,
כשאמר לו המקום הוצא את עמי בנ׳י; *R. Joshua b. Korha*:
לכן בקש המקום להרגו; (28) ib., *R. Jose b. Halafta*: (29) ib.,
עשאן המקום כתים כתים; *R. Joshua b. Hananja*: (30) P. 60 A:
מכעיסין למקום; (31) P. 61 B: (32) P. 58 B,
והמקום הודה לדבריך
המן הזה שנתן לנו המקום: (33) P. 58 B:
הבאר שנתן לנו המקום; *R. Joshua b. Hananja*: (34) P. 58 B,
עתיד המקום ליתן לנו שש מידות; *R. Eleazar of Modiim*: (35) P. 58 B, *Papajos*
ולא עמד א׳ מהם לברך למקום עד שבא יתרו; *R. Eliezer*: (36) P. 63 B, *R. Jehuda b. Ilai*:
מנין א״א שאמר הקב״ה למשה וכו׳ גדול משה שהודה לו המקום
אלא שאמר המקום למשה לפרוש מן ה׳; (37) P. 67 B: (38) ib.:
מלמד שאמר המקום; מלמד שהסכים המקום על ידו; (39) P. 65 B:
למשה הריני קורא לך מראש ההר ואתה עולה; (40) P. 66 A: ומנין
כך אמר המקום לישראל אנכי; שהודה המקום לדבריהם; (41) P. 67 A:
אמר להם המקום; (42) P. 67 B, *R. Jose b. Halafta*: (43) P. 70 A,
היקש מוראת; *Rabbi*: היקש כבוד אב ואם לכבוד המקום; (44) ib.:

הקיש קללת או׳א לקללת המקום; (45) ib.: או׳א למוראת המקום; (46) P. 70 B: שכל מי שעובד ע״ז מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו מנאף אחר המקום; (47) P. 71 B, *R. Nathan*: מנין אתה אומר שהראה המקום לאברהם אבינו גיהנם וכו׳; (48) P. 100 B, R. Eliezer (Yalkut r. R. Ishmael): בשישראל עושין רצונו של מקום הם עושין שמיטה אבל המקום קרוי לשון שבח אל: (49) P. 101 B: אחת בשבוע וכו׳; אלהים שדי צבאות אהיה אשר אהיה חנון ורחום ארך אפים וכו׳; (50) P. 104 A: בזמן שישראל עושין רצונו של מקום מלאכתן נעשית על ידי אחרים; also p. 104 B, and M. R. S. b. J. in the name of R. Ishmael.

We have seen a few instances of interchanges between מי שאמר והיה העו׳ and הקב׳ה,[22] likewise between המקום and הקב׳ה.[23] We are enabled to show that many times, where our texts have הקב׳ה, the original form must have been המקום. In other cases, where such evidence cannot be brought forward, we assert that the alteration was effected in the Amoraic or later period, or the passage is of a post-Tannaitic origin. We register first of all the passages which have been altered by a later hand. These are: (1) P. 11 A: שמשה חלק כבוד לא במקום אחד אמר לו׳ לזקנים וכן הקב׳ה. Sifre iv, § 92, reads: ולא בשנים המקום חולק כבוד לזקנים ובכל מקום שאתה מוצא זקנים המקום חולק כבוד לזקנים. The compiler of Exodus rabba[24] quotes this saying as a תני ר׳ שמעון בן יוחאי, (2) P. 14 A: הן עשו בסתר, והקב׳ה פרסם אותם בגלוי; in the Tannaitic source preserved in b. Sotah 9 A we read a similar sentence: ד׳א היא עשתה בסתר שהיו קוברים מיתיהם והודו ושבחו המקום פירסמה בגלוי; (3) P. 24 A: להקב׳ה שלא ראו אויביהם; M. R. S. b. J. reads לשם; ושבחו; (4) P. 28 B: באותה שעה הראה להם הקב׳ה תורמיות תורמיות של מה׳׳ש, v. above under מקום, No. 8, where the text reads המקום in the very same sentence; (5) P. 31 A: וכן אתה מוצא שאין הקב׳ה עתיד ליפרע מן הרשעים בגיהנם אלא ברוח קדים,

[22] v. p. 126. [23] v. pp. 121.

[24] 5. 15: תני ר׳ שמעון בן יוחאי בכמה מקומות שנינו שחלק הקב׳ה כבוד לזקנים; v. also Lev. r. 11. 5: דתני ר׳ שמעון בן יוחאי לא במקום אחד ולא בשני מקומות מצינו שחלק הקב׳ה כבוד לזקנים אלא בכמה מקומות; Tanh., Exodus, ed. Buber, p. 17, r.: אמר הקב׳ה בעוה׳ז חלקתי כבוד לזקנים.

v. p. 30 A: שלא נפרע המקום מהם אלא ברוח קדים; (6) P. 31 B: א׳ל הקב׳ה מי שקידש שמי על הים יבא וימשול על ישראל, Tos. 12, l. 8: גדולה אמונה לפני הקב׳ה: (7) P. 34 A: א׳ל מפניו שקידש שמו של מקום שבשכר אמונה שרתה עליהם רוח הקודש, M. R. S. b. J. 57 reads וכן אתה מוצא שאין הקב׳ה: (8) P. 36 B: לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם עתיד להפרע מן המלכיות לע׳ל עד שיפרע משריהן תחלה M. R. S. b. J. 58: (9) P. 36 B: שאין המקום נפרע מן המלכיות עד שמפיל את שריהן; והרי כל אומות שבעולם אומרים שבחו של הקב׳ה, M. R. S. b. J. 59: שהרי אומות העולם אומרין ניאותו ושבחו של מי שאמר והיה העולם ניינו ושבחו של הקב׳ה לפני: (10) P. 37 A: R. Jose, the Galilean: אדבר בשבחו בניאותו ובשבחו של מי שאמר, M. R. S. b. J. 60: או׳ה והיה העולם; (11) ib., *R. Akiba*: אדבר בנאותיו ובשבחיו של הקב׳ה אומר ניאותו ושבחו של מי שאמר והיה העולם לפני M. R. S. b. J. 60: או׳ה; (12) P. 38 A, v. already above, p. 125; (13) P. 39 A: מגיד שכל מי שקם נגד ישראל כאלו קם נגד הקב׳ה, Sifre Num., § 84: שכל מי שקם נגד ישראל כאלו קם נגד המקום; (14) P. 39 B: וכל מי שעוזר לישראל כאלו עוזר להקב׳ה, Sifre Num., § 84: אבל הקב׳ה אומר מי שעוזר לישראל כאלו עוזר למקום; (15) P. 41 B: אבל הקב׳ה אומר עשרת הדברים כאחת, ib.: שני דברים בדיבור אחד אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא אמר עשר M. R. S. b. J. 6 B: הדברות בדיבור אחד; (16) P. 41 B: אבל הקב׳ה אינו כן אלא מוראו על מי שאמר וחיה העולם, M. R. S. b. J. 67: אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן מוראו על קרוביו יותר מרחוקיו שלא introduced by אבל הקב׳ה אינו כן אדם תאב במדת בשר ודם מדת המקום; (17) ib.: לבנים נותן לו תאב לחכמה נותן לו, תאב לנכסים נתן לו M. R. S. b. J. 67: אבל הקב׳ה בונה; (18) ib.: אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן שלא במדת בו׳ד מדת העליון ואח׳כ בונה התחתון, M. R. S. b. J. 67: המקום — אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא בונה עליון; (19) P. 42 B: אבל הקב׳ה צר צורה במים, Mekh. R. S. b. J. 67: אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא צר צורה במים, introduced by והקב׳ה צר צורה; (20) ib.: שלא במדת בשר ודם מדת המקום בעפר; M. R. S. b. J. 67 reads instead: אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אבל הקב׳ה צר כולה כאחת; (21) ib.: צר צורה באפילה, M. R. S. b. J. 67: אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא כשהוא צר צורה צר הכל כאחד; (22) P. 41 B: אבל הקב׳ה אפילו כל באי עולם באין וצועקין לפניו הוא שומע צעקתם, M. R. S. b. J. 67: אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא כל באי עולם עומדין בתפלה לפניו ושומיע תפלתם

(23) P. 42 A: מגיד שכל הנפשות בכף של הקב"ה, M. R. S. b. J. 67: כשהקב"ה; (24) P. 72A: מגיד שכל הנפשות ביד מי שאמר והיה העולם מגיד הכתוב כשהמקום, M. R. S. b. J. 67: נוטה ידו רשעים כלים מן העולם אמר הקב"ה אתם: מטה את ידו הרשעים פונין מן העולם; (25) P. 42 A: אמר להם המקום אתם, M. R. S. b. J. 67: צדקתם עליכם את הדין; (26) P. 44 A: אלא הצדיקים היו מובטחים ויודעים שהקב"ה עושה להם נסים וגבורות עת שיוצאין ממצרים התקינו להם וכו', M. R. S. b. J. 71: מובטחין עם יציאתן ממצרים שהמקום עושה להם נסים וגבורות ולפיכך נטלו; (27) P. 45 B, *R. Simon b. Gamaliel*: בא וראה כמה מפורשין דרכי הקב"ה מדרכי בו"ד, בו"ד במתוק מרפא את המר, M. R. S. b. J. 73 reads R. Ishmael b. R. Johanan b. Berakha: א"ל עד; (28) P. 47 B: כמה מפורשין דרכי בשר ודם מדרכי המקום שאתם ישינים במטותיכם הקב"ה מפרנס אתכם, M. R. S. b. J. 76: מ"א למד ששקולה יציאת מצרים כיצד; (29) ib., המקום מפרנס אתכם שעשה: כל הנסים וגבורות שעשה הקב"ה לישראל, M. R. S. b. J. 76: המקום לישראל; (30) P. 48 A: שכשם שגזר הקב"ה כן היה, Yalkut: וכל כן למה אמר הקב"ה מוטב שילקה; (31) P. 48 A: שכשם שגזר המקום המקום נגלה: עמוד הענן ואל יסקל משה ואהרן, M. R. S. b. J. 76: בעמוד ענן אמר המקום מוטיב ילקה עמוד הענן ואל יסקל משה וא'; (32) P. 48 B: אם כן זמן הקב"ה למכעיסיו ק"ו שישלם שכר טוב לצדיקים, Jalkut: זמן המקום; (33) P. 49 A, R. Tarphon: כביכול פישט הקב"ה ידו ונטל תפלתן של אבות, M. R. S b. J. 77, R. Eleazar of Modiim: כביכול פישט המקום את ידו וקבל תפלתן של אבות; (34) P. 50 B, 51 A, R. Joshua b. Hananja: אם תשמרו שבת זו עתיד הקב"ה ליתן לכם שש מדות טובות; M. R. S. b. J. 78, R. Eleazar of Modiim: אם תזכו לשמור שבת עתיד המקום ליתן לכם; (35) P. 52 B: אמר לו הקב"ה כל מקום שאתה מוצא רגלי אמר לו [המקום] כל מקום: M. R. S. b. J. 81: אדם שם אני לפניך וכי ידיו של משה מגברות ישראל: (36) P. 53 B: שאתה מוצא וכו' או ידיו שוברות עמלק אלא כל זמן שמגביה ידיו כלפי מעלה היו ישראל מסתכלין בו ומאמינין במי שפקד משה לעשות כן והקב"ה עשה להם נסים וגבורות, M. R. S. b. J. 82, R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos: אלא בזמן שישראל עושין רצונו של מקום ומאמינים במה (במי read) שפקד המקום למשה המקום עושה להם נסים וגבורות, v. above, M. R. H. iii. 29 A; (37) P. 54 A: אלא כ"ז והקב"ה עשה להם רפואות, M. R. S. b. J. 83: שישראל עושין רצונו של מקום ומאמינין במה שפקדן הן מתרפאין; (38) ib.: הקב"ה חם עליהם, M. R. S. b. J. 83: המקום חם עליהן; (39) P. 54 B: אמר משה לפני הקב"ה רבש"ע על ידי הוצאת את ישראל

וכו׳, M. R. S. b. J. 83: אמר משה לפני המקום; (40) P. 56 A, R. Joshua b. Hananja: כשבא עמלק להזיק את ישראל מתחת כנפי אביהם שבשמים אמר משה לפני הקב׳ה רבש׳ע, M. R. S. b. J. 84, R. Eleazar of Modiim: לפי כשבא לאבד את ישראל תחת כנפי השמים אמר משה לפני המקום רבש׳ע; (41) P. 57 B, R. Eleazar of Modiim: בשעה שאמר הקב׳ה למשה לך הוצא את עמי, M. R. S. b. J. 86: אימתי שלחה בשעה שאמר לו המקום; (42) P. 65 B, R. Eliezer: מניין אתה אומר שאין הקב׳ה מדבר עד שמשה אמר דבר שכבר קבלו עליהם בניך, and R. Akiba: מלמד שנתן הקב׳ה כח וגבורה במשה והיה הקב׳ה מדבר עד שאמר וכו׳ אלא כן הוא הדבר וכו׳, v. M. R. S. b. J. 101: כבוד גדול חלק למקום; (43) P. 65 B: לו המקום למשה שלא היה המקום מדבר עד שאמר וכו׳, v. also p. 72 B, R. Akiba, cf. M. R. S. b. J. 114; מלמד שהרכין המקום ב׳ה; (44) P. 88 B, in the well-known saying of R. Johanan b. Zakkai: חם הקב׳ה על כבודן של בריות, v. above, p. 117, to Tos. B. K. vii. 10: חס המקום, v. also B. K. 79 B; (45) P. 94 B, R. Simon b. Johai: כל המשתף שמו של הקב׳ה בע׳ז חייב כלייה, v. b. Sanh. 63 A: כל המשתף שם שמים וד׳א, the same reading must have been the original in the previous sentence beg. אלולי ששתפו, and M. R. S. b. J., p. 50; (46) p. 102 A, R. Simon b. Johai, Yalkut r. R. Ishmael, v. also Sifre Deut., § 104: כנגד ג׳ בריתות שכרת הקב׳ה, v. M. Tann. 75: שכרת המקום, v. also, p. 57, R. Simon b. Johai: שלא כרת ע׳ המקום מ׳ח בריתות.

In these forty-six passages we have been able to show that there are other readings besides הקב׳ה. We propose, now, to deal with the passages, with reference to which we have no literary evidence enabling us to substitute the original term. In some of these cases the fact must be ascribed to an accident, or we have to deal with an Amoraic supplement or gloss. Most of the sayings to be dealt with belong to the anonymous Haggada, but there are some ascribed to older authorities, who, according to our experience, could not have used the term הקב׳ה. We will deal with a few passages: (1) 2 A: שלוחי הקב׳ה לא כשלוחי בו׳ד, b. B. B. 25 A, our saying is quoted in the name of R. Hoshaja: שלוחיך לא כשהקב׳ה גוזר גזירות טובות ורעות על בבשר ודם שלוחי בו׳ד וכו׳; (2) ib.: ישראל על הטובה מחזירים לפניו וכו׳. The saying is quoted Yalk.

Ezra 349, and Job 924, in the name of R. Josiah: perhaps it belongs also to R. Hoshaja? In the Babyl. Talmud the saying is quoted in the name of *R. Aha b. Haninah* with slight alterations. (3) 57 B, from שבשעה שאמר הקב׳ה למשה לך הוצא את עמי בנ׳, does not belong to the saying of R. Eleazar of Modiim, but is an addition from the Amoraic Haggadah, P. 59 A: שכל מי שמוציא דין אמת לאמיתו מעלה עליו הכתוב כאלו היה שותף עם הקב׳ה במ׳ב בראשית, M. R. S. b. J. 89 reads כאלו שותף במעשה בראשית. Here we have reliable literary evidence that the original saying was altered by the Mishna teachers of the Amoraic period. B. Shabb. 10A, R. Hijja b. Rab, of דפתי, quotes this saying with some other additional words: כל דיין שדן דין אמת לאמיתו אפילו שעה אחת מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו נעשה שותף להקב׳ה במעשה בראשית. Other variants of this saying also suggest that this sentence is of Amoraic origin. R. Samuel b. Nahmani says in the name of R. Jonathan b. Eliezer: כל דיין שדן דין אמת לאמיתו משרה שכינה בישראל, based on Ps. 82. 1 (v. also Exod. r. 30. 20, and b. Zeb. 109 B). P. 63 B: In the sayings of R. Judah and Rabbi הקב׳ה and המקום are alternately used. We saw already above, p. 128, that the copyists or teachers availed themselves of this method, in order not to repeat the same term twice. Mekh., R. S. b. J. 96 reads in R. Judah's saying also הקב׳ה, v. also 66 A. P. 66 B, ולא על הנגלות בלבד נגלה הקב׳ה עליהם לכרות ברית, is probably a gloss from the Tanhuma, v. ed Frankfurt a. M., 96 B. P. 66 B, R. Nathan says: מכאן תשובה למינים שאומרים שתי רשויותהן שכשעמד הקב׳ה. All texts read so, v. Yalkut Lekach Tob. ii. 133. Neither שמים nor מקום nor שכינה would do in such a case. There must have been quite a different phrase, which was altered for some reason. P. 71 B, באותה שעה אמר הקב׳ה, and in the saying of R. Judah b. Ilai, אמר הקב׳ה, v. above to Tos. Erakhin, i. 10, p. 116, esp. note 63. M. R. S. b. J. 113–4 these additions are not given. P. 98 A, שאין הקב׳ה מקפח שכר כל בריה, is quoted in the Talmud and Midrash in the name of Amoraim. B. K. 38 B, by R. Hijja bar Abba in the name of R. Johanan, with the additional clause, אפילו שכר שיחה נאה; v. also Pes. 114 A, Nazir 20 B, Hora-

joth 10 B, Exod. r. 31. Similarly is the phrase, מיום שברא הקב״ה עולמו, p. 104 B, an Amoraic phrase.

It is true that there are still a few sayings left which contain הקב״ה. Especially Haggadic portions which are ascribed to such authorities as R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos and R. Joshua b. Hananja, or R. Matjâ b. Heresh, &c. The previous list has convinced us that the Tannaim did not use the term הקב״ה. R. Joshua b. Hananja and R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos figure in that list conspicuously as having used המקום. The same observation can be made in the Mishna and Tosefta. Considering the fact that the *final* redaction of the Mekhilta must be placed in the Amoraic period and can be classed as one of the latest of the Tannaitic Midrashim, there can be no surprise that the name הקב״ה occurs more frequently than in the other old sources.

Besides these principal names, e.g. השמים, המקום, מי שאמר והיה הע׳, and הקב״ה, there are numerous others, most of which are dealt with in the previous chapter.[25]

In the Mekhilta of R. Simon b. Johai the term הקב״ה was also substituted for המקום. The final compilation of the Midrash is, with good reason, ascribed to Hezekia, the son of R. Hijja. Thus we find pp. 1f in the sayings of R. Simon b. Johai, R. Jose, and R. Joshua, מפני מה נגלה הקב״ה, although the first saying contains in the latter part המקום, and the second, מי שאמר והיה העולם. Both terms belong to the Tannaitic Haggada. In the second sentence of R. Joshua we read בוא וראה כמה רחמיו וזכיותיו של הק׳בה על ישראל, varying the teaching of Akiba, that 'God shares Israel's troubles and exiles, but also rejoices in his people's joy'. The dialogue between a heathen and R. Gamaliel shows clearly that the term הקב״ה is due to editorial alterations. The questioning heathen or philosopher generally refers to God as אלוה or

[25] v. אדיר, אלהים and אלוה. דיין, הוא, יודע מחשבות, יוצר, חי העולמים, רבון, קונה, עליון, מעלה, מרום, מלך, כבודו של עולם, יחודו של עולם, שכינה, רוח הקודש and שם.

אלהים; here הקב׳ה was put instead of the heathen's term.[26] The saying of R. Eleazar b. Arakh has both terms, חקב׳ה and המקום (p. 2): מפני מה נגלה חקב׳ה משמי מרום — לפי שיכול המקום שידבר.[27] The same teacher quotes in his diatribe the words of the heretics against God's justice and righteousness, calling them בזויי העולם 'the despised of the world', in which the terms אלוה and בעל העולם occur. 'Lord of the World' is a special gnostic term for the Demiurgos. The objection of the latter was to the expression ויחר אף ד׳ במשה (Exod. 4. 14), which ascribes anger and feelings of wrath to God. The explanation of R. Eleazar b. Arakh לא דבר דברה תורה בלשון בני אדם (p. 2) means nothing else but הקב׳ה אלא בדרך ארץ. Yet, even in this overworked text there are traces of המקום (p. 3). Similarly attention may be called to the name בעל הרחמים 'Lord of Mercy' (p. 3).

The Mekhilta to section וארא contains the exposition of ten Tannaites on Exod. 6. 2. The ten sayings are not in chronological order, and show the signs of a more recent arrangement. It is no wonder, therefore, that the later term הקב׳ה stands for המקום. The term deserves attention (אני־הוא שאמרתי והיה העולם) in R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos's saying, and אדון העולם in that of R. Judah b. Ilai. The reading, רבון העולמים instead of רבון העולם in R. Eleazar of Modiim's sentence is also remarkable.

To a greater extent this Mekhilta reads המקום, even where our Mekh. has הקב׳ה, as we have shown already. Here some passages will be quoted in which the older terms occur. P. 13: ד׳א אני ה׳ מלכות וכל מקום שמזכיר גיאה של ע׳ז שם מזכיר שבחו של המקום. The idols are referred to as אלהים. P. 17: the old term גבוה is used, and in Abba Saul's sentence, בידי שמים occurs in opposition to בידי הדיוט. P. 18 (v. also p. 27): מלמד שצבאות מקום נקראו צבאות ישראל וצבאות ישראל נקראו צבאות מקום, v. to Mekh. 10 A, where צבאות מה׳ש stands for צבאות מקום.

[26] v. Exod. r. 2. 9, where R. Joshua b. Korha disputes with the heathen, and Num. r. 14, R. Gamaliel.

[27] Likewise were the other sayings of the same scribe altered, like היה מכחיש הקב׳ה and לא דבר הקב׳ה עם משה.

P. 21: גלוי וידוע לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם שכשישראל. P. 22: לפי שמצינו שפרשה ראשונה אמ'ל המקום למשה — שמע מפי הקודש.[28] P. 24: ואין המקום מוחל לו לאדם עד שיפיים את חבירו; this saying agrees with that of R. Eleazar b. Azarja, b. Joma, 85 B; v. above, p. 110. P. 25: The Egyptians feared the Israelites as people fear their God (כבני אדם שיראים מן קוניהם). P. 47, R. Simon b. Johai: לעשות רצון אביו שבשמים. P. 50: אדון המעשים ברוך הוא and אדון כל המעשים.

(4) Our fourth source, the *Siphra*, offers less material for our purpose than the Mekhilta. R. Akiba, R. Eleazar b. Azarja, and R. Simon b. Eleazar speak of God as 'the Father in Heaven.'[29] R. Eleazar b. Azarja uses the term גבוה.[30] גבורה is applied in the usual way when speaking in the name of God.[31] God as creator is called either מי שעשה את העולם[32] or more frequently מי שאמר והיה העולם.[33] Similar to גבוה is the term מעלה.[34] More frequent are the names signifying God's kingship, by Abba Saul (p. 75 B: פמליא למלך ומה עליה להיות מחקה למלך), R. Eleazar b. Azarja (82 B: נמצא פורש מן העבירה ומקבל עליו מלכות שמים), R. Simon b. Johai (p. 74 B), Rabbi (p. 95 B), and in several anonymous sentences.[35] Secondly שמים, especially in sanctifications or in connexion with God's name. Pappus and Lulianus, the martyrs, say אנו חייבין מיתה עד לשמים (93 B), R. Simon b.

[28] v. also p. 41: מפי הקודש.

[29] 110 B, R. Akiba: משה שליח בין ישר' לאביהם שבשמים; 82 B, R. 96 A: אבל אפשי ואבי שבשמים נזר עלי; 78 B, R. S. b. J., v. M. Kelaim, above, p. 113, and 87 A (anonymous): אדם שעושה את התורה ועושה רצון אביו שבשמים.

[30] pp. 96 B, 104 B, 114 B.

[31] p. 3 B: את הדברים לפני הגבורה.

[32] p. 11 A: לשם מי שעשה.

[33] Rabbi 74 B: גלוי וידוע לפני מ' ש' ו' ה' . . א'ל ולא אחד עשה . . מי שברא את ישראל הוא ברא את האומות והיה העולם; v. also 74 A: אני ה' שאמרתי.

[34] p. 76 A.

[35] 71 B: מניין שאין אהרן לובש בגדים לגדולתו אלא כמקיים גזירת המלך; 113 A: על כורחכם שלא בטובתכם אני ה' הפי זו גזירת המלך; 110 B: שקבלתם מלכותי עליכם במצרים א'ל הין והין קבלתם מלכותי קבלו גזירותי.

Johai (7 A: לא יזכיר שם שמים — לבטלה), and Rabbi (83 B), who speaks of death imposed by Heaven (מיתה האמורה בידי שמים). Further, several times in sayings like מן השמים,[37] בידי שמים,[36] and others.[38] In the majority of cases we read מקום. Thus R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos,[39] who says, 'God does not bring a punishment on Israel unless he warned them first'. R. Eleazar b. Azarja speaks of דברים שבינך ובין המקום.[40] Pappus and Lulianus say to their tyrant: הרבה מזיקים למקום,[41] and R. Simon b. Johai.[42] Many anonymous sayings: 6 A, שהמקום רוצה לי; 71 A, עבירות שבין אדם למקום, v. above, p. 110; 75 B, הקיש מורא או'א למורא המקום, and similar sentences as to honour and curse; 83 B, על אחת כמה נכמה שיעבירנו המקום מן העולם; 84 A, אם לפני בו'ד עושים כן ק'ו; 68 A, חס עליהם המקום מלהעבירם; 108 B, מבקשים שכרם מלפני המקום; 108 A, מלמד לפני המקום; 110 B, כבר הבטיח המקום שיהו עמלים בתורה שהמקום מתאוה שיהו עמלים בתורה לישראל שאין דן אבות ע'י בנים.[43] The term הקב'ה, however, is to be found only twice; some of them are surely Amoraic insertions, others perhaps not original. In any case this Tannaitic work also confirms our observations that הקב'ה was not known to and used in the Tannaitic Haggada.

Besides these names there are occasionally the terms כבוד, by R. Akiba (3 B), R. Simon b. Johai, especially when the seeing of God by human beings is spoken of; v. also 76, חייבים בכבודי. The rule that אלהים denotes the judgeship of God is four times quoted (74 A, 74 B, 75 A, 82 B). Finally

[36] 6 A.

[37] 8 A.

[38] מעשיהם לשם שמים, p. 108 B; לשמים, 106 B; דינר לשמים, 110 A; יכוון את דעתו לשמים, 11 A; and על מלכות שמים, 106 B.

[39] 109 B: אין המקום מביא פורענות בישראל עד שמעיד בהם תחלה.

[40] 71 A, v. also 44 A: שריחם המקום על אהרן.

[41] 93 B.

[42] 108 B: אימתו הוא שבחו של מקום.

[43] T. K. 2 B: מלמד שהרבין הקב'ה, v. already above, p. 132, 3 A, 9 A, שומע מפי הקב'ה, the usual term for this is מפי חגבורה or מפי הקודש, v. 3 A, 71 A, p. 84: חס הקב'ה על הרשעים ק'ו על כבודן של צדיקים, parallels have המקום; 109 A: הקב'ה אמר להם לצדיקים, further עתיד הקב'ה מטייל עם הצדיקים, and finally אין אומר הקב'ה לאו'ה seem to be of Amoraic origin.

שכינה (1 A, 98 B, 78 A, 81 A, 81 B, 110 A) is often repeated, and שם (15 A, 75 A, 93 B, 99 B, 100 A, 110 A) is also frequent.

(5) For the Tannaitic Midrashim on the fourth Book of the Pentateuch we can avail ourselves of the critical edition published by H. S. Horowitz.[44] It is highly interesting to see that in this work the use of the term הקב׳ה is almost unknown, while those of מקום and שמים, but especially the former, are the rule. The study of this text kindles the desire to see a critical edition of the whole Tannaitic Midrash of both schools. We enumerate first the passages which have to be corrected in מקום: (1) § 42, נזול השלום ששמו של הקב׳ה שלום; R.[45] and R. b.[46] read מקום. About God's name being שלום, v. further, on p. 104; (2) § 42 has further a sentence, כשהקב׳ה קורא הכל עונים, which the editor, rightly, considers as belonging to a later gloss;[47] (3) § 61, R. Akiba, והראה לו הקב׳ה באצבע, R. Mekh. מקום, v. also Men. 29 A, Pes. B. M. 5, Pes. r. 15, Exod. r. 15, Num. r. 15. 4, Tanh., Num., and שמיני; (4) § 61, R. Nathan, להודיע שבחו של משה שכשם שא׳ל הקב׳ה כן עשה, R. reads מקום; (5) § 90, באן הקב׳ה ממיך ומשה מגביה, R. מקום, Yalkut, MS. London, Midrash Hakhamim r. המקום; (6) § 91, שהראה הקב׳ה, all MS. and Yalk. read שהראהו; (7) § 92, לשמוע דיבור מפי הקב׳ה, M. H. reads more correctly מפי הגבורה; (8) § 100, והלא אף עם האבות דבר הקב׳ה, no variant, perhaps the editor's gloss (?);[48] (9) § 102, שלא כמדת בו׳ד מדת הקב׳ה, R. מדת המקום ב׳ה; (10) § 105, עד שהשיבו הקב׳ה and בקש מלפני הקב׳ה, M. r. המקום; (11) § 115, כשפדה הקב׳ה את זרע אברהם, R. r. המקום; (12) § 135, R. Nathan, אין הקב׳ה מואס תפלתן של רבים, R. r. המקום; (13) § 137, R. Eleazar of Modiim, בא וראה כמה צדיקים חביבים לפני הקב׳ה, Yalk., M. and R. לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם; (14) § 138, עד שהשיבו הקב׳ה, Yalk., London, M. and

[44] Leipzig, 1917. [45] = MS. Vatican. [46] = Num. r.

[47] The passage in § 58, כשהקב׳ה מדבר הכל שותקים and כשהקב׳ה מדבר בקול גדול may also be later additions, or originally כשהמקום stood, which was altered, because one cannot speak of מקום as speaking or calling.

[48] v. also § 106, הקב׳ה הסגירה, הקב׳ה טימאה וכו׳; § 111, ומהיכן התחיל הקב׳ה; § 119, R Eleazar ha-Kappar, הראה הקב׳ה ליעקב בהמ׳ק; § 141, בן אמר לו הקב׳ה; § 142, מה צוה הקב׳ה את משה בשמחה.

R. המקום; (15) § 143, Simon b. Azzai, שאחד מרבה ואחד מ' לפני הקב"ה, R. מקום, L. M. המקום. We see that the term הקב"ה is, on the whole, very rarely used, and, with the exception of very few cases, the literary evidence goes very far to prove that the use of it is not primary. If we are comparing now with this the use of המקום, it is almost mathematically proved that הקב"ה was not known to the teachers of the Tannaitic period.

Let us now investigate the occurrence of the name הקב"ה in the Sifre zutta. P. 249: ד'א אתה אומר חביב הוא השלום שאלו ברא הקב"ה מדה יפה יותר מן וכו'. P. 249, R. Simon b. Johai: וכן אתה מוצא שלא נתן הקב"ה שכר מדתו של מ"ה הקב"ה. P. 250: שאין הקב"ה עתיד לנחם את ירושלם and תלמוד תורה אלא שלום אלא בשלום.[49] P. 252: זה קידש שמו של הקב"ה על הים והוא ראוי להוריד השכינה. P. 254: משה לא היה יודע אימתי הקב"ה מדבר עמו ובלעם היה יודע מה הקב"ה עתיד לדבר עמו and אלו אדם שלא הכיר נסין של הקב"ה. P. 265: כך אמר הקב"ה איני מהלך שתאמר לי לך. P. 267, R. Gamaliel: לפי שהלשינו ישראל על הקב"ה ואמרו היוכל וכו' וראה הקב"ה. P. 272: כך אמר הקב"ה לישראל. P. 274: שמיום שדבר הקב"ה עם משה. P. 279: והלא הקב"ה ואמר לו כתוב. The difference between the Sifre and Sifre Zutta is noteworthy. It is due either to a later redaction, or, more likely, to the fact that we have no old literary witnesses to establish the right reading in these cases. Yet, even here, the passages with המקום outnumber those with הקב"ה.

Besides המקום our source contains all the old terms of the Tannaitic period, like מי שאמר, גבורה, קונה, שמים, שם, שכינה, והיה העולם (not as frequently as in the other Tannaitic works!) and מעלה.

(6) In the Sifre on Deuteronomy, our sixth source, again we have plenty of proofs that the הקב"ה in the text is not original. P. 64 B, § 1, ed. reads כך אמר הקב"ה לישראל זו ותירה; M. T. 2, כך אמר המקום ברוך הוא לישראל הא לכל מה שעשיתם יתירא כל מה שעשיתם. P. 65 A, in the saying of *R. Judah b. Ilai* (v. M. T., p. 3), אלו הנסיונות שנסו אבותינו הקב"ה; M. T. reads שניסו אבותינו את המקום, M. Aboth, v. 4, has הקב"ה, yet

[49] v. also שלא כונן הקב"ה את מלכות בית דוד אלא בשלום.

MS. Adler, 2585 r. את המקום (v. Mishna). P. 67 B, § 10, המקום אמר לאבינו הקב״ה הבטיח את אברהם אבינו ; M. T. 6 reads אברהם — המקום לא נתן קצבה לברכתינו. Here a whole sentence is missing from the edition. We compare the two texts with each other :

M. T.	Sifre.
אמרו ישראל למשה רבינו אי אפשינו שתברכינו אנו מובטחים על ברכות הרבה המקום אמר לאבינו אברהם כי ברך אברכך וכו׳ ואתה נתתה קצבה לברכותינו א״ל אני בו״ד אני ישלי קצבה לברכותי ה׳ אל׳ הר׳ את׳ ה׳ אלהי וכו׳ . אמרו לו המקום לא נחן קצבה לברכותינו אמר להן זו משלי וכו׳ משל למלך.	אמרו לו רבינו משה אי איפשי לנו שתברכנו הקב״ה הבטיח את אברהם אבינו אמר והרבתי את זרעך וכו׳ ושמתי את זרעך וכו׳ ואתה נותן קצבה לברכותינו משל למלך שהיו לו נכסים הרבה וכו׳.

Through a copyist's error the whole passage between קצבה לברכותינו and קצבה was omitted. Sifre, p. 69, § 21, וייטב בעיני הדבר ולא בעיני הקב״ה ; M. T., p. 11, בעיני היה טוב ולא בעיני המקום ; Sifre, p. 10 B, § 26, כך אמר משה לפני הקב״ה ; in M. T., דוד המלך אמר לפני המקום, א״ל המקום ; ib., כך משה מבקש מלפני הקב״ה ; Sifre 70 B, § 26, לפני המקום ; M. T., כך משה היה מבקש מלפני המקום ; Sifre, p. 71 A, § 27, M. T. 15, יש שקראו עצמם עבדים והקב״ה קוראם עבדים ; M. T., p. 16, והמקום קרא אותם עבדים ; Sifre, p. 73 A, § 31, אלא במדת הקב״ה ; M. T. 25, אלא במדת המקום ; Sifre 74 A, § 33, באי זה צד אוהבים את הקב״ה ; M. T. 26, המקום ; Sifre 75 B, § 37, אמר להם הקב״ה ; M. T. 29, הזהרו שלא תמרדו בהקב״ה שאין אדם מורד המקום ; Sifre 80 B, § 43, הזהרו שלא תמרדו במקום שאין בהקב״ה אלא מתוך שרעה ; M. T. 36, אמר להן המקום ; M. T., אדם מורד במקום אלא אמר להן הקב״ה ; ib., אמר לו הקב״ה הרי לי ; ib., המקום ; M. T., אף הקב״ה פתח להן שנים עדים ; M. T., המקום. Sifre 81 B, אלולא שחפו ישראל שמו של הקב״ה בע״ז היו כלים מן העולם ; M. T. 38, שמו של מקום ; Sifre 85 A, § 49, אלו דרכי הקב״ה ; M. T. 43, אלו דרכי המקום ; Sifre 86 A,

§ 53, ונתן הקב״ה לפנינו ב׳ דרכים; M. T. 45, ונתן לפנינו המקום; Sifre 91 B, § 81, לא נתכוונו להקריב אלא דבר שהקב״ה שונא M. T. 55, אלא מה שהמקום שונא; Sifre 92 A, א״ר עקיבא חס ושלום שהקב״ה מעמיד חמה ולבנה; M. T. 63, שהמקום מעמיד. These instances can easily be increased to show that מקום is the primary reading, and was displaced by the term of the Amoraic period, namely הקב״ה. There are many passages where the original המקום stands in our texts as well.

This survey of the Tannaitic writings teaches clearly that the oldest sources comprise sayings without the name הקב״ה. The later they are the greater appears the influence of the Amoraic Haggada. Wherever and whenever critical resources, even in a limited way, are at our disposal, we cannot help feeling that הקב״ה must be the secondary, and המקום the primary term used by the ancient sages. Yet we have still other proofs to corroborate our contention.

(7) The Haggada in the two works of the Talmud, the Babylonian and the Palestinian, can be used as a test to prove or disprove our theory. It is impossible to give here the whole of our material. It will be consulted and quoted eventually in the course of this treatise. In order to avoid unnecessary repetition we will draw from various parts of the Talmudic Haggada.

The stories, which aim at teaching that a man should give credit to his fellow men for good and not for evil, refer to events in the life of people who lived in the first century, and in all of them the concluding phrase sounds: כשם שדנתי לכף זכות המקום ידין אתכם לכף זכות (b. Shabb. 127 B). The whole passage is taken from a Tannaitic source, when the name הקב״ה was not yet in use. In the story of R. Joshua b. Korha with a certain eunuch, the former says: ברוך המקום שמנעו לאותו האיש מבולם (b. Shabb. 152 A). A Boraita is quoted: תלמיד אחד היה לו לר׳ אליעזר בן יעקב שנתחייב בשריפה למקום (b. Erubin 54 A). Abba Hanan, in the name of R. Eliezer, mentions the old saying of בזמן שישראל עושין רצונו של מקום (b. Joma 3 B). In another Boraita we read יש בהם חובת מצוה למקום (ib., 11 A). An old Boraita has: הרואה אותם צריך שיתן

שבח לפני המקום (b. Ber. 54 B). In the story of Hillel with the proselyte, the latter says: ומה ישראל שנקראו בנים למקום (b. Shabb. 30 B). R. Judah b. Ilai and R. Jose b. Halafta used to say when visiting the sick: המקום ירחם עליך (ib., 12 B). These instances, which can easily be multiplied, may suffice to show that the redactors or editors of the Babylonian Talmud preserved faithfully their sources. If that would not be the case one could hardly explain the fact why Simon b. Shetach, Abba Helkijahu, Hillel's proselyte, and others should speak of המקום and not הקב׳ה? There must be a cogent reason for this remarkable fact. We see in this fact the most eloquent evidence for the genuineness and veracity of our Rabbinic sources.

Many other similar observations can be made in reviewing our material derived from the Palestinian Talmud. R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos says that 'one should comfort a friend at a loss of a slave or cattle with the words המקום ימלא לך חסרונך (pal. Ber. ii. 8)'. At the end of a Boraita: והיו שמחין שהסכימה דעתן לדעת המקום (pal. Sotah ix. 16); also ib., 11: כעם הוא לפני המקום, and וכי יש שינה לפני המקום; j. Sotah v. 6, vii. 7, R. Eleazar b. R. Simon, j. Sotah v. 6, R. Eleazar b. Azarja to R. Akiba, and many more passages.

In many cases the Talmudic texts enable us to reconstruct the original readings in the Tosefta or Tannaitic Midrash. It is true that both Talmudic texts embody sayings by Amoraic Haggadists in which המקום figures. Yet we can account for them in one of two ways. First of all the saying may be of Tannaitic origin altogether. Secondly, some of the later preachers reveal an antiquarian practice of using old phrases. The two texts of the Talmud really belong to the third period of the Rabbinic writings. The latter have to be divided into three groups. First the sources, in which המקום is the general term, הקב׳ה the exception or a later gloss; the second, in which המקום was displaced by הקב׳ה; and the third where הקב׳ה is the rule and המקום the exception. This latter group will be briefly characterized in the next division.

(8) Our observation is even more fully confirmed by the Midrashim, which undoubtedly belong to the period of the Amoraim. We consider first the *Genesis rabba*. There we learn the terms: (1) אדון לכל בריותיך (156), or אדון כל העולם (365, R. Isaac), 'Lord of all Thy creatures', or 'Lord of the whole world;' (2) איש, Man. (19, R. Simon b. Johai, and 92, 3, R. Josiah, r. Joshua b. Levi); (3) אלוה, אלוהות when idols are spoken of, or heathen in dispute with the Rabbis referring to God; (4) אלוף (182, אלופו של עולם); (5) בודק לבבות (67. 8, R. Berechja, א״ל הקב״ה לית את ידע דאנא הוא בודקיהון דלבבא); (6) בורא, Creator, very frequently; (7) בעל דין (93. 11); (8) בעל פקדונות (560, R. Aha); (9) גדול העולמים (565, R. Judah, R. Joshua b. Hananja, 100 8, R. Isaac); (10) גלגל עינו של עולם (R. Aha, 401, v. also 412); (11) דין (85, 246, R. Simon b. Johai, 252, R. Akiba, 334, R. Meir, 519, R. Levi, 93, 11, R. Eleazar b. Azarja); (12) הוא (678, R. Aha); (13) חי העולמים (418, 654, 661, 66. 2, 100. 6); (14) יוצר, several times; (15) יחידו של עולם (24, 198, 200, 354, 511, 98, 18); (16) כבוד, v. 28; (17) מי שאמר והיה העולם (28, 54, 230, 291, 393, 73. 4; (18) מלך מלכי המלכים, seven times; (19) מעלה (119, 572); (20) מרום (65, 5); (21) מרי (114, 131, 140, 272, 99. 3); (22) עליון (220, R. Aibo); (23) צדיק חי העולמים (3) or צדיקו של עולם (570); (24) קדמונו של עולם (356, R. Eleazar b. Simon); (25) קונה (86); (26) רוח הקודש, several times; (27) שבינה, very often; (28) שלום עולמים (66. 2); and (29) שמים. Yet, whilst הקב״ה occurs many hundred times, the term מקום is mentioned altogether three times. First, 67. 2, in a saying of R. Hama b. Haninah, מי הוא זה שעושה סרסור ביני לבין המקום, and 84. 13, in a saying of R. Jannai, נסעו מזה ממדותיו של מקום. Both teachers belong to the first generation of Amoraim, when probably the reform of the name was not yet definitely carried through. The third passage (68. 10) is by R. Huna in the name of R. Ami, when the name מקום was entirely discarded and out of use. The teachers and preachers at that time inquired as to the meaning of the term, and advanced their theories.

(9) The same result can be gathered from a thorough

examination of the Tanhuma (I. Buber). Here we meet the same names, with some additions as in the Genesis rabba. Throughout the name הקב׳ה is dominant, which occurs several hundred times. The term מקום is mentioned altogether five times (v. ii. 116, R. Jose b. Halafta : הנה אני במקום הזה אין כתיב כאן אלא הנה מקום אתי מקומי טפל לי ואני טפל למקומי, iii. 64; v. however ib., R. Simon, iv. 55, iv. 88, 120, 144, and v. 22, R. Levi). R. Samuel b. Nahman, who speaks of מקום של רחמים and מקום של פורענות, does not seem to assume that the term מקום is still connected in the popular mind and speech with the name of God (i. 99).

(10) Pesikta of R. Kahana has also הקב׳ה as a most significant feature; מקום, however, in six places. These are (1) 15 A, R. Huna, in the name of R. Idi, חס המקום על כבודו של צדיק; (2) 96 B, R. Levi, מתחטאים לפני המקום; (3) 147 A, R. Simon b. Johai, וישראל מצפים לישועתו של מקום; (4) 182 B, הוא צוח לפני המקום; (5) 165 A, עושים רצונו של מקום; and (6) 165 A, R. Levi, אנו באים לפני המקום. We may assume that here, as well as in the Tanhuma, these Tannaitic sentences remained unchanged.

(11) The Midrash on Psalms contains fourteen passages with מקום, whilst the majority have הקב׳ה. Some of these passages are surely of Tannaitic origin or belong to teachers of the early Amoraic period, others are borrowed from Tannaitic sources.

(12) Midrash Samuel (ed. Buber, Cracow, 1893). This Midrash has אלהים (pp. 70, 79, 109, 133), either in dialogues by heathen, like the Matrona, or with reference to heathen deities, but never as substitute for המקום or הקב׳ה, we observed in some books (e.g. Exodus rabba and Numbers rabba). Further בורא (pp. 98, 120), בעל פקדונות (p. 98, R. Aha), the old Tannaitic מי שאמר והיה העולם (p. 77, היה העכבר אומר לספסל אני שלוחו של מי שאמר והיה העולם, originally from Sifre Num. 88, cf. Yalkut Samuel, 91, in a saying of Abba b. Zutra in the name of R. Samuel b. (Nahmani), אבל מי שאו׳ה ב״ה אינו כן אלא מתקן את הרטיה ואח׳כ מכה, Cant. r. 4. 5, v. ר׳בא בשם ר׳ שמעון; here the source of the idea can be traced back

to Tannaitic sources, 134, להודיע שבחו של משו׳ה שהוא מקרב את הרחוקים ושמח וכו׳, further מלך and מלכות שמים (pp. 63, 84, R. Simon b. Johai, Simon b. Menasse, 64 and 141, ממ׳ה הקב׳ה), and מקום once in a saying of R. Isaac, p. 52, v. however Gen. r., ch. 48, ed. Th., 480. Tanh. B, i. 84, ed. F., and Ag. Ber., ch. 19, may be that the alteration is due to the quotation in Tanh., בכל מקום; the latter name occurs only once, and even there it is doubtful. The name הקב׳ה is quoted very frequently. Most of these sayings belong to the teachers of the third century. There are one or two exceptions. In a dialogue of the Matrona and R. Jose b. Halafta, p. 62, the question is לכמה ימים ברא הקב׳ה את עולמו? It is rather unusual that the interlocutor should use this term instead of the usual אלהיכם. Gen. r. 68. 4, Lev. r. 8. 1, Pes. B. 11B have the same reading. All are dependent on Gen. r., where the tendency is proved to have prevailed to substitute הקב׳ה for other terms. The same may be the case in Bar Kappara's sentence, p. 74, עשה הקב׳ה את שאינו נראה. There are further the terms רבון כל חעול מים (pp. 47, 48, 64, 83), רחמנא (p. 44, R. Phinehas b. Hama, אלא במאן דרחמנא רעי ביה), שכינה (in the sayings of *R. Hijja*, 71, וכי שכינה היה עומד? אלא כל זמן שהוא עומד לפני באלו עומד לפני השכינה, and *R. Judan*, 141, כל המעיז פניו במלך באילו מעיז פניו בשכינה), and שמים (p. 64, שפרקו עול שמים, p. 84, R. Simon b. Johai; v. above מלך, *sc.* מלכות שמים, and 124, כבוד שמים in antithesis to כבוד עצמו).

(13) Other Midrashim, like Lam. rabba, Eccles. rabba, Cant. rabba, Leviticus rabba show the same characteristics. The term המקום is found very rarely in them, and in such form that we are enabled to recognize their origin at once.[50] The later Midrashim, however, which have many excerpts from older works, and in which the term הקב׳ה was antiquated and supplanted by the older אלהים, have המקום more frequently. Such are the younger Jelamdenu, Exodus rabba, Numbers rabba, Seder Elijahu,[51] and Pirke R. Eliezer.

[50] Lam. r. has המקום twice, 27 and 42; M. Samuel once, 52; Agadath Bereshith, twice, 11 and 32.

[51] We give here the names of God in the Seder Elijahu or Tanna debe

The Palestinian and Babylonian Talmud report the Tannaitic sayings mostly with the old terms. There is no better proof for the authenticity of a saying than the term for God's name. In a genuine old saying the term שמים or מקום; in an overworked or later report הקב׳ה occurs. Now it is very interesting to observe that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries הקב׳ה of the third group and the האלהים of the later Midrashim have been supplanted by המקום, even in Amoraic sayings. This is a specially characteristic feature

Elijahu rabba (ed. Friedmann, Wien, 1900). This work offers fifteen names. Some of them occur only once or twice, e. g. אב הרחמים (pp. 19, 67). אלוה in speeches or questions of heathen, like p. 5. מפני מה ברא אלוה שקצים וכו׳, p. 31. 'Happy this people, whose portion is the Lord, their God', p. 27. Terah is told, 'make me a God' (אלוה), likewise אלהות for deities, pp. 52, 151, ? וכי יש אלוה לעולם, but האלהים is also used in the fashion of Exod. r. and Num. r., v. p. 145. Once אלהי ישראל, p. 51, and יראת אלהים, p. 83, and אלהים שבשמים, p. 8, instead of אב שבשמים and יראת שמים respectively. The author likes the name בוחן לבות וכליות for God, pp. 30, 44, 48, 126. בורא occurs twice, pp. 27, 139. Like Midrash Samuel, S. E. R. calls God בעל הפקדון, p. 8. The term גבורה is used in a somewhat different sense from that in the older Midrashim, pp. 91, 108; all are drawn and go out from before the Geburah, or, 'thus the angels of destruction descend on the command of the Geburah, and take them. God is the judge' דיין (pp. 5, 56, &c.). Very frequent the old Tannaitic מי שאמר והיה העולם (pp. 4, 5, 9, 15, 17, 22, 31, 69, 96, 97, 103, 104, 105, 124 (twice), 132, 133 (twice), 139 (nineteen times), some of which may well have been excerpted from Tannaitic sources. Especially interesting is p. 69: שמו של הקב׳ה מי שאמר והיה העולם ברוך הוא. 'God's kingdom', 'the kingdom of Heaven'. God as King of all kings is very much emphasized in this work. The term מעלה occurs in connexion with כנגד ב״ד של מעלה, and כלפי מעלה, פנים של מ׳, בבוד של מעלה. Exceptional is the very frequent use of the term המקום in the S. Elijahu R. The sermons and meditations generally begin with ברוך המקום ברוך הוא, giving expression to the doctrine of God's omniscience, goodness, justice, wisdom, omnipresence, and creatorship. Yet the passages with הקב׳ה are even more numerous. It seems that the S. E. R. adapted the old introductory form of ברוך המקום, which is to be found in the Mishna and Tosefta. This work is also rich in passages with רבון העולם, or rather רבון כל העולמים, שבינה and שמים. There is no other Midrash which offers such a rich source for the understanding and explanation of the term 'Father in Heaven', as will be seen in the chapter treating on the relation of God to man.

of the Midrash collections and excerpts coming from the school of Rashi. There must be some deeper reason for these alterations, the finding of which is, however, outside our task. It can be solved only on the other hand with the help of all the manuscripts available. For our present purpose we must be content to have shown the development of the post-Biblical names of God, which are really Prolegomena to the Old Rabbinic doctrine of God.

B.

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

(1) *Omnipresence.*

God is everywhere present, in heaven and on earth, in the upper and lower worlds; He fills this and all the other worlds, which are numerous; there is no space, whether on the ground or in the hollow of the air, which is not filled by the divine majesty, or thought of as free from the Shekhina. In this attribute, as in many other outstanding and significant problems of our doctrine, we can feel the influence of external polemics, and the impulse of internal creative power in dogmatic developments. We have, to begin with, *R. Gamaliel II.* His dialogues on this subject are to be analysed in the chapter of God's existence and unity. He is invisible, His place is not known, but there is no place void of the Shekhina. The teaching was repeated and elaborated in the School of R. Ishmael.[1] The Shekhina is everywhere. This view is opposed to that taught in the Mekhilta[2] that the Shekhina does not dwell in the countries outside Palestine. We may see in this point also a difference between the two Schools. Many passages in the Bible are quoted to show the doctrine of God's omnipresence, like Ps. 139. 6–10, Zech. 4. 10, Prov. 15. 3, Amos 9. 3, Job 34. 21. Yet this School seems to have made a distinction between Shekhina and God. R. Jose b. Halafta was surely moved by heretic theories when he preached, 'Never descended the

[1] v. b. B. B. 25 A: ואף ר' ישמעאל כבר שכינה בכל מקום.

[2] 1 B.

Shekhina to the earth, and never did Moses or Elijah ascend to Heaven.[3] One cannot fail to express amazement at such a sentence, which ignores many words in the Bible, like Exod. 19. 20. A Boraita enumerates ten of God's descents, and details them by enumerating some passages from the Bible. They played a great part in Haggadic lore.[4] The same scribe revealed his opinion on our problem in another saying of his addressed to his son, R. Ishmael: 'If thou wilt behold the countenance of the Shekhina in this world, study the Torah in Palestine.'[5] God is everywhere present, but can be seen only through study of the law in Palestine. Thirdly, R. Jose b. Halafta deals with our problem in an often-quoted sentence, 'We do not know whether God is the place of His world, or the world is His place'. From Exod. 33. 21 we derive that God is the place of His world, and not *vice versa*.[6] Although the tradition as to the authorship of this saying is not perfectly established, inner reasons entitle us to ascribe it to this Tannaitic teacher of the second century. The deep thought expressed by this teacher anticipated metaphysical teachings of many a great thinker in the last centuries. A contemporary of our teacher, R. Meir, convinces us that the Scribes were interrogated about our teaching. According to our texts R. Meir was asked by a Samaritan to explain Jer. 23. 24: 'Behold I fill heaven and earth'. How could God speak to Moses

[3] b. Sukka, 8 A; b. Shabb. 89 A.

[4] v. Pirke R. Eliezer, chaps. 14, 25, 39, 40, 41, 48; Aboth R. N. ch. 34; Gen. r. 38. 12, 49. 10, תני רשב"י; Tanh. f. 13 A. The Hellenist, Aristobul, tried to explain these descents in a spiritual sense and to do away with the anthropomorphic conception, which contradicts the doctrine of God's omnipresence.

[5] M. Ps. 105. 1, ed. Buber, 448: אמר ר' יוסי בן חלפתא לר' ישמעאל בריה מבקש אתה לראות פני שכינה בעולם הזה עסוק בתורה בארץ ישראל.

[6] So Gen. r. ch. 68, ed. Theodor, 777; Exod. r. 45. 6; R. Jose b. Hanina, Midr. ha Gadol, 446 r.; R. Jose b. Abun; Tanh. Ex., ed. Buber, תשא, 16, has also R. Jose b. Halafta; it was also in the lost parts of pal. Makkoth and Sifre, v. S. b. Z. Duran, מגן אבות, ii. 9; v. now also M. Tannaim, 222, and above as to the history of מקום as God's name, p. 92.

from between the two divisions of the ark? R. Meir demonstrates by bringing large and small mirrors—that the figure of man changes according to the size of the looking-glass. If that is possible in the case of a human being, how much more likely is this with God.[7] Both teachers, as we know from other sources also, were well aquainted and in frequent communication with intellectuals and philosophers of their respective places of residence, Sepphoris and Tiberias. No wonder that the doctrine and its relation to the Bible cropped up in their discussions. The difficulty gave rise to the theory developed on the lines of R. Meir's reply to his interlocutor, of God concentrating His Shekhina in a certain place.[8]

Turning now to the teachings of the Amoraim, we notice that R. Hoshaja took trouble to repeat the teaching of R. Ishmael's school that God is omnipresent. He bases his homily on Neh. 9. 6: 'Thou, O Lord, art alone, Thou hast made the heaven, &c. Thy messengers are unlike the messengers of earthly kings. The latter return to the place whence they are sent forth, but God's return at the place whither they were sent to'; cf. Job 38. 35, 'Where-ever they are they are in God's presence'.[9] R. Joshua b. Levi remarks to Neh. 9. 6 ('and the hosts of heaven bow down before Thee'): 'Come, let us be grateful to our ancestors, who taught us the place of prayers'.[10] The same teacher forbids to walk proudly on account of Isa. 6. 3 ('full is the whole earth of His glory'): 'It looks

[7] Gen. r. 4, ed. Th. 27 f.: אמר לו אם שאתה בשר ודם משנה עצמך בכל מה שתרצה מי שאמר והיה העולם ע'א בו'כ.

[8] Called צמצום.

[9] b. B. B. 25 A: שלוחיך לא כשלוחי בו'ד שלוחי בו'ד ממקום שמשתלחים לשם מחזירין שליחותן אבל שלוחיך למקום שמשתלחין שם מחזירין שליחותן. v. Mekh. 2 A has the same saying anonymously: שלוחי הקב'ה לא כשלוחי בו'ד ששלוחי בו'ד צריכין לחזור אצל שולחיהם אבל לפניך אינו כן וכו' בכל מקום שהן מהלכין נמצאו לפניך. We have here one of the many Amoraic interpolations of the Mekhilta.

[10] b. B. B. 25 A, meaning to say that every place is fit for prayer.

as if the creature would boast himself before his maker' (b. Kid. 31 A). He developed further R. Jose b. Halafta's idea of God's omnipresence in a sermon based on Jer. 23. 24. One might infer from this passage that God fills merely heaven and earth, the upper and lower worlds. This is a mistake! The whole universe together is not greater than God's smallest finger can contain or touch (M. Ps. 8. 6, ed. B. 78: לפי שהקב"ה אומר להן והלא את השמים ואת הארץ, דעו כי העליונים והתחתונים אין בהן אלא כמעשה אצבעותיך, fuller ib., 19. 6, p. 165: אין בה אלא כדי מישוש אצבעו של הקב"ה). The parable leaves no room for doubt that the whole sermon is directed against the critics of God's creation, the Gnostics, who alleged the inferiority of the 'Jewish' God (v. also Tanh. iv. 29: כביכול הקב"ה מלא עליונים ותחתונים שנ' הלא את השמים, ובמקום שבא הנואף לנאוף הלא הקב"ה בכבודו שם שנ' מלא כל הארץ כבודו, and M. Ps. 62. 3, p. 307, R. Hijja b. Abba of Jophe: מניין שהקב"ה מלא חללו של עולם שנא' הלא את השמים; further Num. r. 9. 9, Tanh. נשא 8 to Prov. 15. 3, Zech. 4. 10, אמר הקב"ה אפילו בחללו של עולם, Mekh. Deut. r. 2. 28, אני ממלא העליונים והתחתונים). R. Simon b. Lakish follows R. Jose b. Halafta in explaining the saying of God's descent on Mount Sinai. Although it appeared as if God descended on Sinai (Exod. 19. 20), yet the Sinai was dependent on Him; cf. Ps. 68. 18).[11] R. Levi expounds Exod. 40. 35 by the parable of a cave, which was situated near the sea. It once filled with water, but the waters of the sea were not diminished. The Tabernacle was full of God's glory, yet the world did not lack anything of the glory.[12] R. Isaac, R. Ammi, and others repeat R. Jose b. Halafta's saying as to God being the habitation of the world, and not the world the habitation of God.[13] R. Phinehas b. Hama expresses the thought in this way: 'A worldly king can be either in his bed-chamber or in his reception room, but he cannot be in both of them at one and the same time. God

[11] M. Ps. 68. 10, ed. Buber, p. 319.
[12] Pes. 2 B; ib. r. 19 B; Cant. r. 3. 10; Num. r. 12. 4; Tanh. ii. (ויקהל).
[13] Gen. r. 68. 9; M. Ps. 90. 10, p. 390.

fills both in the same moment'. Cf. Ps. 148. 13 and Jer. 23. 24.[14]

The often-quoted parallel between God and the human soul dwells on the fact that the soul fills the whole body, likewise God the whole universe. This idea is derived from R. Gamaliel II's reply to his questioner.[15] The doctrine is further illustrated in a legend. R. Tanhuma relates that once a whole company of pagans boarded a ship, and a Jewish child was among them. A great storm threatened the boat, and all the lives on it were in the greatest danger of being lost. Each of the passengers took his idol in his hands, prayed to it, but to no good purpose. Then, seeing that their gods could not help, they turned to the Jew, and said to him: 'Boy, rise and entreat your God, for we have heard that He hears your supplication whenever you cry unto Him!' He poured out his heart in prayer. God heard his request, and the sea became silent. When they reached a port, all of them went to provide themselves with the supplies for their journey. The Jew remained on the boat. His fellow travellers asked: 'Do you not buy any provisions?' The Jew replies: 'What do you want of such a poor stranger as I am?' They said: 'You a poor humble stranger? We are strangers. Some of us are here, and our gods in Babylon or Rome; others carry their gods with them and derive no benefit from them whatever. You, however, wherever you go, your God is with you.'[16] 'God', says R. Isaac, 'is with his creatures on the scaffold, in fire, water, in the den of lions, and saves them, which cannot be said of a human friend, even of the mightiest of kings, because they are confined to one place, and cannot

[14] Num. r. 12. 4. He emphasizes also that God is near to all His creatures, although He seems to be far removed, whilst the idols seem to be very near, yet they are indeed very far away, unable to hear the prayers of those who entreat them; pal. Ber. 13 A; M. Ps. 4. 3.

[15] b. Sanh. 39 A; Exod. r. 29; Pirke R. El. ch. 7; M. Ps. 103. 5; b. Ber. 10 A; Lev. r. iv. 8; Deut. r. 2. 37.

[16] pal. Ber. 13 B.

appear everywhere.'[17] It is natural that this doctrine was developed in no other religious system as in Judaism. The whole doctrine is alien to the spirit of polytheism. The teachers of Jewish religion advanced religious thought immensely by putting this idea in the forefront of their speculations. A correlative of this doctrine is the universalistic aspect of the Rabbinic doctrine of God, which will engage our attention in the chapter dealing with God's relation to man. This is a subject which has not met with much appreciation on the part of modern theologians.[18]

(2) *Omniscience.*

With the conception of omnipresence is closely connected the doctrine of the omniscience of God. Since God is everywhere present, He knows man and the world, history and life, wherever they happen to be and whenever they originate and pass away. He knows the thoughts of men before they are conceived, and foresees actions prior to their existence. Since the omnipresence is not only in space but also in time, as a consequence God's knowledge has no limit either in space or in time. There must be a cogent reason for repeating and emphasizing this idea so often. We notice even in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings that great stress is being laid on this doctrine. The writers of those books, with very few exceptions, do not get weary of repeating God's omniscience. This was surely due to some mighty opposition to this theological conception. God knew the world before it was created. He knows the secrets of the heart before they rose in men. No sinner can hide his misdeeds before Him. The teaching found its way into one of the most solemn

[17] pal. Ber. 13 A; v. also R. Eleazar, ib., 13 B.

[18] v. however, now, Moore, *History of Religions*, ii, 1920, p. 69, and G. Kittel, *Probleme des pal. Spätjudentums und Urchristentums*. Stuttgart 1926, p. 133 f.

prayers in Jewish liturgy. 'Thou knowest the secrets of the world, and the hidden thoughts of every life; Thou searchest the chambers of the womb, and testest the sinews and heart!' is the Jew's prayer on the Day of Atonement. 'Nothing is hidden from Thee, nor is anything covered from before Thy eyes!'[1] The preachers introduced their homilies by announcing emphatically this attribute of God: ברוך המקום ברוך הוא שמכיר בראש ובסוף, ומגיד מראשית אחרית מקדם עד שלא נעשה ויודע מה שנעשה ומה שעתיד להיעשות וצופה לטובה ואין צופה לרעה.[2] R. Johanan b. Zakkai explained to his pupils why the Law dealt more severely with the thief than with the robber. The latter treated master and slave in the same way. The former thought of God's eye, as if it could not see, and His ear, as if it could not hear (cf. Isa. 29.15, Ps. 94.7, Ezek. 9.9). They had to contend against those who thought that God cannot see and discern human actions.[3] R. Joshua b. Hananja is reported to have been asked by the Romans (רומיים): 'Whence do we know that God will revive the dead and knows the future?' The scribe replied by quoting Deut. 31.16: 'And the Lord said unto Moses, "behold thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, and rise up, and the people will go whoring after the gods"', &c. The questioners were not satisfied, for they read: 'And the people will rise up', &c. R. Joshua said: 'Do admit at least that God knows the future!'[4] R. Johanan repeats the same doctrine in the name of R. Simon b. Johai,[5] who dwells on this teaching in another homily, also saying: 'A human being does not know his minutes, times, and hours, but God knows them'.[6] R. Ishmael asks as to Exod. 12.12 ('when I see the blood'). 'Is not everything revealed before Him? He knoweth what is in the darkness, and light dwelleth in Him' (Dan.

[1] Mahzor Vitry, 390–91.

[2] S. E. R. ch. 1, p. 3; M. Tadshe, p. ix; E. D. Z. in Yalkut Deut., § 827; Tanh., f. 74 A.

[3] B. K. 79 B, and paralls.: השוה כבוד עבד לכבוד קונו כביכול עשה עין שלמעלה באילו אינה רואה ואזן של מעלה באילו אינה שומעת.

[4] b. Sanh. 90 B; v. also Oppenheim, האסיף, vi. 1894, 97.

[5] Ib.

[6] Gen. r. 10.10, ed. Theodor, 85.

2. 22). 'Yea, the darkness hideth not from Thee' (Ps. 139. 12).[7] The verb does not mean to say that God saw, but that God revealed Himself as a reward for performing the duties connected with the Passover. According to a second interpretation God remembered the sacrifice of Isaac.[8] The Siphre Zutta explains the term אלהי הרוחות 'God of Spirits' (Num. 27. 16): 'God, who knows the mind and spirit of each individual, whether high or low, whether humble or quarrelsome', implying the teaching of God's omniscience.[9] There were other passages in the Scriptures which gave rise to many objections to this teaching and called for doubts. Sayings like Gen. 13. 17, 32. 12, Jer. 18. 8, Jon. 3. 10, 1 Sam. 15. 35 caused trouble to the ancient translators,[10] Philo[11] and the writers of the Clementines.[12] The latter saw in all these instances later insertions of the Jews. One of these objectors asked R. Joshua b. Korha about Gen. 6. 6: 'Do you not say that God knows the future?' R. J. b. K.: 'Yes.' Heathen: 'How do you account, then, for God's repentance and grief?' R. J. b. K.: 'Well, have you got a son?' H.: 'Yes.' R. J. b. K.: 'What did you do when he was born?' H.: 'I rejoiced and caused others to rejoice with me!' R. J. b. K.: 'Did you not consider that the boy would die?' H.: 'Yes, but one should rejoice at the time of joy, and mourn in time of death.' R. J. b. K.: 'The same is the case with God!'[13]

Great stress was laid by the Amoraic preachers on the

[7] Mekh. 8 A, 12 A.

[8] Ps. Jonathan translates in this sense: ואחמי ית זכות אדמה, i. e. of the Passover-sacrifice and of the circumcision (12, 13), yet v. 23 he translates literally, ויחמי ית אדמא; v. Onkelos, ויחזי ית דמא.

[9] v. ed. Horowitz, p. 320.

[10] v. Dähne, Gesch. Darstell, ii. 38.

[11] Quod deus sit nesciunt, 296.

[12] Schliemann, *die Clementinen*, 198.

[13] Gen. r. 27. 7; 1 K. H. 57 A: אין הקב"ה רואה את הנולד. The heathen questioner speaks of הקב"ה, v. above, p. 69. On the opposition of the Gnostics to this doctrine, v. Harnack, *Origines*, i. 32; about similar inquiries in the Middle Ages between Jews and Christians, v. Beth Talmud, iii. 12.

idea that sinners cannot hide their evil deeds or wicked thoughts before their Maker. R. Hoshaja[14] expounds Isa. 29. 15, a passage which R. Johanan b. Zakkai used already for the same purpose,[15] rebuking those 'that seek deep to hide their counsel from the Lord, and their works are in the dark, and they say: 'Who seeth us and who knoweth us?' Like an architect, who built a palace with all its rooms, channels, and underground places, and became their tax-collector, and said: 'I built all these secret places; from whom do ye hide yourselves? God formed man and he wants to hide himself from Him, and thinks that God does not know and see! R. Jannai[16] treats this doctrine at some length with reference to Ps. 11. 4, 'The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try the children of men'. Like a king who owned an orchard, he gathered workmen into it. At the gate of the orchard there was a treasury full of precious things. The king said: 'Whoever will discharge his work wholeheartedly shall get his wages; hence the others will be judged in my palace'. God is the King of all kings. The world the orchard. Children of men the workmen. Those that observe faithfully the Torah will receive their reward in the Garden of Eden, the others will be punished in Hell. God says: 'Although I seemingly removed my Shekhina from the sanctuary, yet my eyes behold!' R. Johanan bar Nappacha must have had special reasons to recur so often to our doctrine. We saw above that he preserved a saying of R. S. b. J. on our subject[17]: 'God can behold the upper

[14] So in edd. Gen. r. 24. 1; v., however, Th. 229; R. Levi; M. Ps. 14. 1; Tanh. B. iv., נשא, 8; Num. r. 9. 1.

[15] v. above, p. 154.

[16] Tanh. ii. 6; Exod. r. 2. 2; M. Ps. 11. 3, ed. B. 99, quotes another parable similar to that given above, p. 152, in the name of R. Phinehas b. Hama, to illustrate God's omnipresence: מלך בו'ד כשהן נכנסין לטרקלין אינו רואה מה בקיטון אבל הקב'ה אינו כן. If a king enters the triclinium, he cannot see what happens in the κοιτών; not so God. His throne is in Heaven, yet He צופה ומביט בכל העולם ואין עין שולטת בו, sees everything, though he is invisible.

[17] v. above, p. 154.

and lower world with one glance; not so a human king'.[18] 'God beholds the deeds of all creatures[19] at one glance.' R. Simon b. Lakish taught that God foresaw both worlds with one glance.[20] The same teaching is further developed by R. Abbahu and R. Hijja bar Abba.[21] The former teaches that God foresaw the deeds of the wicked and righteous, the latter speaks of the building, destruction, and rebuilding of the Temple. The 'foresight' of God is one of the most favoured motifs of the Haggada.[22] God knew that in future righteous and wicked would arise, that Israel would receive the Torah and sin; Moses and Thorah passed before His eyes long before their birth, the knowledge of the nations,

[18] Gen. r. 9. 3, ed. Th. 68: מלך בו׳ד בונה פלטין מביט בעליונים ראיה אחת ובתחתונים ראייה אחת אבל הקב׳ה מביט בעליונים ובתחתונים ראייה אחת; v. also 12. 12: אבל הקב׳ה ברא העליונים ואת התחתונים ברייה אחת 'All the worlds were created at the same time'.

[19] b. R. H. 18 B, Rabba b. Hama, in his name: וכולן נסקרין בסקירה אחת v. also Num. r. 11. 6.

[20] Gen. r. 9. 3: העולם הזה והעולם הבא הביט בהם הקב׳ה ראיה אחת.

[21] Gen. r. 2. 5, ed. Th. 18, according to Gen. r. ch. 3. 10, ed. Th. 23, one would be inclined to suggest R. Jannai instead of R. Abahu, and R. Hijja 'the great', instead of R. Hijja b. Abba. In that case R. S. b. L. developed the teachings of the earlier Haggadists.

[22] A few instances will suffice. Gen. r. 1. 5, ed. Th. 6 f.; R. Samuel b. Isaac, צפה הקב׳ה שאחר כ׳ו דורות ישראל וכו׳; Gen. r. 4. 8; R. Tanhum b. Hanilai, ed. Th. 30, מתחלת בריית העולם צפה הקב׳ה משה כי קרוי טוב; Gen. r. 6. 1, R. Hanina b. Hama, ed. Th. 40, אלא צפה הקב׳ה שאו׳ה עתידין לעשות; Gen. r. 8. 4, R. Berekhja, ראה צדיקים ורשעים יוצאים ממנו; Gen. r. 9. 6, R. Hanina b. Hama, צפה הקב׳ה שנ׳נ וחירום מלך צור עתידיו מתחלת ברייתו של עולם, לעשות עצמן אלוהות; Gen. r. 9. 13, R. Joseph, צפה הקב׳ה שהוא עתיד לקרוא צפה הק׳ במדה עליה תגר לפיכך; Gen. r. 17. 5. R. Aha, וצפה הקב׳ה שיעקב עתיד לעמוד ממנו, v. above, Gen. r. 1. 5; Gen. r. 74. 2, R. Abbahu, צפה הקב׳ה שלא היתה כוונתה אלא לשם שמים; Gen. r. 98. 4, R. Judah b. Simon; Exod. r. 41. 3, R. Phinehas b. Hama, צפוי וגלוי לפני הקב׳ה שעתידין ישראל, v. also Exod. r. 3. 3 and 40. 1, צפה הקב׳ה וראה שישראל מקבלין התורה; Tanh. iv. 23, צפה הקב׳ה שקרח עתיד לעמוד; Tanh. iv. 24, צפה הקב׳ה שעתידין ישראל להבעים לפניו. We find the verb צפה in connexion with the knowledge of the future of many biblical persons, v. Gen. r. 11. 2 (Adam), Ag. Ber. 12 (Jacob), Gen. r. 3. 2 (the earth), &c.

idol-worship as well as the deifying of the individual, dates back to the creation of the world. The Haggadists and Liturgists further furnish the phrase, רבהע' גלוי וידוע לפניך 'Lord of the whole world, it is revealed and known before Thee!' by which the prayers of biblical personages in the Haggada are introduced. The fact that God knows past and future, the thoughts of human souls, and sees all movements of the body, is one of the most firm religious convictions of the Scribes. A few instances of these Haggadic prayers will bear out the truth of this observation, which was of great influence on the earliest liturgical compositions.[23] The omniscience of God is due, according to some, to His creatorship; according to others, to His uniqueness or unity. The first thought is expressed by R. Hoshaja[24] or R. Levi, and also in anonymous sayings.[25] R. Levi, R. Eleazar b. Pedath and R. Berekhja see it proclaimed in Ps. 33. 15, 'He who formed together their heart, understands all their deeds'.[26] Others, like R. Phinehas b. Hama, R. Judah b. Shalom, and R. Abun base it on Job 23. 13, 'He is One'. Owing to His Oneness He knows the judgement and mind of His creatures.[27]

Many other Bible verses teaching the omniscience of God were amplified and elaborated in the homilies and teachings of the Scribes (1 Chron. 28), 'The Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imagination of the thoughts'. God understands man's thoughts before they have been formed.[28] Even before man is born his thoughts and

[23] For the phrase גלוי וידוע v. R. Simon, Pes. 43 B: וכבר גלוי וידוע לפניך שאין או"ה מקבלים את תורתך; ib., 200 A, R. Abbahu: גלוי וידוע לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם שאין או"ה מקבלין את התורה.

[24] v. above, note 14; M. Ps. 14. 1.

[25] Tanh. נשא, 6–8.

[26] pal. Ber. 13 A.

[27] Tanh. וירא, 21; Exod. r. 14.

[28] M. Ps. 45. 4, ed. B., p. 270: עד שאין אדם צר את המחשבה בלבו הקב"ה עד שאינו ידבר אדם הוא יודע מה בלבו הקב"ה מבין; Exod. r. 21. 3: where the saying is ascribed to R. Eleazar ben Pedath; v. also Gen. r. 9. 3, where the teaching is repeated by R. Haggai and R. Judan in the name of R. Isaac. The first reads: קודם עד שלא נוצרה מחשבה בלבו של אדם

actions are known to God. Secondly, Jer. 23. 24, 'Can anyone hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him?' R. Levi makes the Holy Spirit say to those Israelites who left the manna, so that insects issued from their tents: 'You think that you are acting in secret places, and I do not see? Can a man hide in secret', &c.[29] R. Benjamin b. Levi interprets the sentence: 'If anyone hides himself in secret, shall I not show him and put him to shame before the world?'[30] Thirdly, Isa. 46. 10, 'Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times that are not yet done. Everything is foreseen by God',[31] which is merely a repetition of, or a support for, R. Akiba's saying, הכל צפוי 'Everything is foreseen'.[32] The doctrine of divine foreknowledge is older than R. Akiba. R. Johanan b. Zakkai and his pupil. R. Joshua b. Hananja, taught the same. Both were preceded by Simon b. Shetach, who used בעל מחשבות 'Lord of Thoughts', or יודע מחשבות, as one of God's names.[33] Fourthly, Ps. 139. 4, 'Thou, O Lord, knowest all'. David says before God: 'Thou knowest my resting and rising, all my steps I am going to walk in future (Job 14. 16), even before I was born (Jer. 1. 5), there is no word on my tongue Thou dost not know!'[34]

Owing to God's omniscience he is also called הרואה ואינו נראה 'The Invisible, Who beholds all'.[35] He is not seen even by the creatures who carry His throne, according to

כבר היא גלויה לפניך, the latter r. קודם עד שלא נוצר יצור כבר מחשבתו גלויה לפני.

[29] Tanh. B. ii. 68.

[30] Tanh. B. iv. 29; Num. r. 9. 9, reading אַראנו instead of אֶראנו, combining it with Zech. 4. 10 and 2 Chron. 16. 9, 'the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole world'; v. also Tanh. i. 24; v. also Prov. 15. 3.

[31] Tanh. iv. 68; Num. r. 16.

[32] Aboth iii. 17.

[33] v. above, p. 79.

[34] M. Ps. 528.

[35] v. R. Hoshaja, j. Peah 8. 8: דין דחמי ולא מתחמי אל קבל פיוסך; b. Hag. 5 B: תזכו להקביל פנים הרואים ואינן נראין; Deut. r. l. 9, R. Berekhja: ומי הוא אלוה האלהים הרואה ואינו נראה; M. Ps. 91. 1, R. Judah b. Simon: כל המעשים רואה ואינו נראה, R. פרוזדוק b. נחשא in his name; Ps. Jon. Gen. 24. 12 and 25. 11.

R. Akiba. Simon b. Azzai adds that even the everlasting ministering angels cannot behold His glory.[36]

(3) *Omnipotence.*

This attribute is another characteristic doctrine which places the religious thought of the Israelites higher than the climax of all the religions of Egypt, Mesopotamia, Persia, Greece, and Rome. Christianity, owing to the influences of Hellas and Rome on one side, the Mystery Religions on the other, could not adapt itself completely to this higher conception. The nature of polytheism and magical conceptions contradicts or denies this attribute of the Godhead. If magic could influence God, if God Himself was addicted to magical performances, then His strength is not worth much. If a god, even the highest, is not free in his actions and deliberations, and even the Greek Zeus is dependent on the members of his household, the Zarathustrian god hindered by his counterpart, then there is no room for the idea of omnipotence. A great drawback of the polytheistic religions is the idea of the sexes among Gods. Here again the Christian religion could not rid itself entirely of pagan teachings. The goddess curtails by her sympathies and antipathies, likings and dislikings, weakness of judgement and strength of feelings, the plans of the highest God. The religion of the Rabbis was free from all these shackles of superstition and misconception. Israel knows no goddess, and is free from magic and witchcraft, which perished in the long fight during centuries, and disappeared from the soil of Palestine. Whatever remained in dark corners of life and love, habits and beliefs, law and religion, adapted themselves to a purer monotheism. There can be no doubt that people and scribes, educated and uneducated, priests and laymen, consented to the belief and thought that 'God's strength and might fill the earth'.[1] When the teachers

[36] Siphra 4 B; Num. r. 14. 22.

[1] Cf. Ps. 106. 2; Pirke R. E. ch. 3; v. also b. Megilla, 16 B, R. Eleazar.

and preachers in the schools and houses of worship spoke of גבורה 'Might', all the hearers knew without any need of further information that the all-powerful God, the Almighty Father in heaven was meant. Curiously enough this most expressive word was not used when describing or depicting the miracles of life, the wonders of nature, the riddles of the universe, and the almost incomprehensible work of creation, but to the great revelation of God's being and teaching to His people Israel on Sinai.[2] By this testimony these men testified their own greatness and worth. For man's greatness lies not in his contribution to material progress of mankind, but by making visible by moral and spiritual light, by piety and wisdom the light of the unseen worlds. The 'Gebhurah' was 'the Power of God', manifested in the light of the Torah. The Gospels (Matt. 26. 64, Mark 14. 62) quote this word (δύναμις), and knew that God = גבורה = δύναμις have the same meaning. Luke did not understand it, therefore he added 'the might of God' (τοῦ θεοῦ), which is superfluous (Luke 22. 69). We have seen that many Scribes of the first and following centuries knew this name.

The Scribes contribute a good many new points to the elucidation of this attribute. We do not meet at this stage of doctrine the idea of the incomprehensibility of God's power. We do find, however, many traces of the teaching that man is unable duly to express God's greatness and power. They must have had their own theories, some of which are recorded, some unknown, about nature and history, life and death. God was the centre of all that is great and powerful, of wisdom and might. The rebukes and warnings against those who tried to give utterance to God's greatness and might, presuppose that there existed conceited people who pretended to do so. They were put in their right place. 'Who can express by words the mighty acts of God, and who can show forth all his praise? Is there a being in existence who is able to utter the mighty deeds of God, or who can praise Him according to His

[2] v. p. 82.

greatness? No, not even the ministering angels are able to do so!' The angels, we learnt above,[3] cannot see God's glory, nor can they utter all His praise, power, and greatness. Such an attempt was earnestly rebuked and severely criticized by the teachers. There is a good historical reason for the fact that the teachers of the third century devote much attention to this problem. Strong words were used to condemn the heaping up of epithets in prayers or sermons. R. Johanan b. Nappacha, one of the authoritative spokesmen of the age, says: 'He who speaks or relates too much of God's praise will be uprooted from this world (life).'[3a] Since those expressions, נעקר מן העולם, or נטרד מן העולם, and מחבלע מן העולם are always used to express disfavour of heretic, especially Gnostic, ideas and thoughts, we can guess whom the teacher of Tiberias had in his mind when he pronounced his statement. Gnostics thought that by their intuition and magic one could penetrate into the chambers of heaven; they dared and pretended to reveal in their theosophical studies God's power. We are told that R. Johanan and R. Jonathan, when visiting a place in the South, heard a reader, who may or may not have been an adherent of some Gnostic sect, say in the Eighteen Benedictions, האל הגדול הגבור והנורא האדיר והאמיץ, and these scribes ordered him to be silent![4] All the names and attributes, synonyms, and expressions, can never convey the idea of God's power and might. R. Huna, another teacher of this age, seems to imply the thought of the incomprehensibility of God's might. Basing his words on Job 26. 14, he says: 'All that thou seest is merely an infinitesimally small part

[3] v. p. 159 f.

[3a] b. Meg. 18 A, based on Job 37. 20; pal. Ber. 12 D; M. Ps. 19. 2, ed. B. 163. In the first place R. Abba b. Hana, in the second and third R. Abbahu teaches this in the name of R. Johanan. The first preserved the saying: המספר שבחו של הקב"ה יותר מדאי נעקר מן העולם, the second: אם בא אדם לספר גבורותיו של הקב"ה מתבלע מן העולם.

[4] pal. Ber., 12 D; v. however M. Ps. 163, where, more correctly, R. Haninah b. Hama went with R. Jonathan, and not R. Johanan; v. also b. Ber. 33 B.

of God's ways. Man cannot conceive the meaning of the thunder, hurricane, storm, the order of the universe, his own nature; how can he boast of being able to understand the ways of the King of all kings?'[5] In this age the opinion was repeated that even the greatest men of antiquity, like Moses, &c., could not reach a proper view of God's greatness. It is too much for the human mind. Moses prays for such a revelation, according to R. Johanan, but his request is not complied with.[6] The words of Zophar, the Naamathite (Job 11. 7) were understood to teach the incomprehensibility of God's creation on the part of man. Moses admitted the futility of man's endeavours to penetrate into the riddles of God's might, and David confesses, after many disappointments of research and seeking to reach it, that man cannot come near to the knowledge of God's greatness and power.[7] It has been pointed out already [8] that the omniscience of God, his wisdom, fostered the value of knowledge, encouraged research, and put learning and wisdom on a very high level, but there are barriers before the human mind, which cannot be broken down, which prevent access to the gnosis of God's power, origins of world and man. The answers to Whence and Whither are withheld. The scribes, with all their love of and longing for, the gnosis, admitted modestly their inability to satisfy their desire of expressing God's omnipotence. If all the seas were ink, all the forests supplied pens, all the heavens folded into parchments, all the hands and tongues of men could not approximately describe or depict God's power and greatness. Mortal man is too weak or insignificant, small and powerless to utter immortal God's power and might! This

[5] Gen. r. 12. 1; Eccles. r. 2. 12.

[6] M. Ps. 25. 6, ed. Buber, 211, R. Berekhja, in his name; v. also the parable of the medical practitioner. God's answer is אין אתה יכול לעמוד על מדותי 'man cannot fully grasp God's attributes'.

[7] M. Ps. 139. 1, ed. B. 527; v. also Tanh. iii. 80: אין בריה יכולה לעמוד על מעש, or אין אדם יכול להגיע לגבורותיו של הקב"ה.

[8] v. above, p. 157, note 22.

thought was repeated in homilies and parables. A very remarkable homily furnishes us with material on our problem particularly, and on the attributes of God especially. To Exod. 15. 1, 'I will sing unto the Lord', an ancient preacher remarked: 'Unto God it is meet to attribute greatness, power, glory, victory, and majesty; cf. 1 Chron. 29. 11. When a king enters a city, he is praised as a hero, whilst he actually is weak; as a wise man, whilst he is a fool; as a rich man, whilst he is poor; as a kindhearted man, whilst he is cruel; as a just judge, and he has none of these virtues. Quite different is the case with God (מי שאמר והיה העולם)! His power, wealth, wisdom, love, justice are much higher than the praise which can be expressed by man. In this sense sang the Israelites on the sea: "I will sing unto Him"!'[9] In another homily a preacher explains Ps. 19. 2, 'A king ruled over many cities. The people of these places said: "The king has so much gold, silver, &c., so and so many slaves, jewels, &c."' A clever old man, who listened to them, said: 'Whence do you know all this? You are living so far from your king? Have you seen his wealth? The people of the city, where he dwells, are entitled to speak of the king's wealth and praise him.' Thus says David: 'The whole earth and its fulness is unable to relate God's praise. Who is able to do so? The heavens relate the glory of God.'[10]

[9] v. Mekh. 35 A, M. R. S. b. J. 57 proves the attributes of *wisdom*, from Prov. 3. 19, Job 12. 3; *wealth*, Deut. 10. 14, Hag. 2. 8; *love*, Exod. 34. 6, Deut. 4. 31; *justice*, Isa. 30. 18, Ps. 82. 1; *faithfulness*, Deut. 7. 9 and 32. 4; *beauty*, Ps. 89. 7 and 9, 86. 8; Cant. 1. 10–16. We see here that not the Greeks alone attach importance to the attribute of beauty, as Farnell, (*Attributes of God*, Oxford, 1926, p. 211, although he refers to the Psalmist's 'Out of Zion hath God appeared in perfect beauty'), assumes, but the rabbis did so likewise. The Mekh. R. S. b. J. omitted here the passages for the attribute of power. Mekh. supplies Deut. 10, Ps. 24. 8, Isa. 42. 8, Jer. 10. 6. Altogether the quotations and biblical proofs for the attributes are more complete in the Mekh. than in the M. R. S. b. J. For *wisdom* Mekh. cites also Prov. 2. 6, Dan. 2. 21, Jer. 10. 6; for *wealth* Ps. 24. 1, Ezek. 18. 4; for *love* Ps. 25. 6, 145. 9, Dan. 9. 9; for *justice* Deut. 1. 17, and 32. 4. The M. is quoted Tanh. B. ii. 1 in a shortened form and M. Ps. B. 454.

[10] M. Ps. B. 112.

A teacher[11] extends this deficiency of human knowledge even to the understanding of God's providence and care for His creatures. 'Wherefore does the text say, it is asked, לעושה נפלאות לבדו He, who performs wonderful things by Himself?' Does anyone help Him? or does He require help? No, but man is unable to relate God's greatness and wonders, which he (man) enjoys. 'Therefore', says R. Aha,[12] 'man cannot express the multitude of God's kindnesses experienced by, and shown to him.' R. Berekhja formulates this thought: 'Praise Him as much as you can, and you will not find it sufficient!' Other contemporary teachers point out: 'David praised God with all the limbs of his body, and yet all his efforts proved unsatisfactory.'[13]

In spite of this conscious weakness of the human mind, the Haggadists did not neglect preaching on and dealing with this doctrine. They applied similes and parables to bring home this conception to their hearers. One tannaitic Haggadist develops the following aspects of our teaching:[14] (*a*) God has power and strength, soldiers, and leads in war;[15] (*b*) His power and strength are unchanged through the ages; (*c*) God does not change His love and mercy even in chastising His creatures; (*d*) God *changes* His decrees issued against His creatures, in case they repent; (*e*) God hears all who pray and cry unto Him in their distress; and (*f*) God's providence extends, even during His fight against the Egyptians. None of these deeds can be imitated by a human being, however mighty he may be. Every reader who has followed with any attention the history and problem of the philosophy of religions, must credit this teacher of the first or second century with

[11] M. Ps. B. 271; Yalkut Ps., § 751 r. R., פרוזדוריא בר נחשא; v. also M. Ps. 106. 1 B, 453, 136. 2, B. 518; pal. Ber. 9. 1.

[12] M. Ps. 88. 1, ed. B. 380.

[13] v. M. Ps. 18. 2, B. 135 f.; Tanh. ii. 1; R. Judah ha Levy b. Shalom; Huna, the priest, b. Abin; R. Simon and R. Abin ha Levy.

[14] Mekh. 38 A; M. R. S. b. J. 61 has only nos. 2, 4, 3; nos. 1, 5, 6 are not given there.

[15] תכסים, i. e. battle-order.

deep insight in religious philosophy. He touched, and in the original probably dealt at length, with the attributes of omnipotence, the problem of God's immutability and infinity and the doctrines of God's love and mercy. He can be excused for cramming so many vital questions of religion in such a brief space. In the hand of Philo such a series of subjects would require books or a volume. Yet the state of our literary documents is responsible for the brevity of the tradition. The chief idea is, however, quite apparent. God's power is unparalleled in this world, bears no comparison to our conception of power. What God can do no human might can perform, or come near to His work. So far the tendency is clear. Why has he filled it also with the other doctrines? One can understand his references to God's love and mercy even when sitting in judgement over people. The attributes of love and mercy do not contradict His omnipotence. All of them are infinite. His omnipotence is manifested further in the efficacy of prayers. The latter again touches very closely on the mutability of God. By the way, there seems a hopeless contradiction between *b.* (God's power is unchangeable), and *d.* (God changes his decrees). To see clearly, we must first of all discuss the question of prayer, and secondly, that of repentance in relation to God's immutability.

The efficacy of prayers was often, seriously and lightly, argued about. Here the question may have been: 'How can God hear all the prayers uttered at different places at the same time? How can God fulfil the contradictory requests of the various worshippers in the same place?' One wants rain, the other drought? Thirdly, if God's decrees are settled, how can prayer upset them? Consequently, if God decreed death, poverty, or barrenness, how could human prayer affect life, wealth, and children? It is a well-established doctrine of Rabbinic theology that prayer can bring about changes and is effective. Prayer is a means by which death, famine, plague, drought, flood, earthquake, war, and storm can be averted from the individual as well

as from the community. Instances for this generally-held view can be brought from history as well as legends, homilies, and teachings. It is interesting to compare here the views on this subject of the Church Father, Tertullian, with those of the rabbis. The former writes in chap. xxix of his treatise on prayer, which is styled *Of the Power and Effect of Prayer*: 'For what has God, who exacts it, ever denied to prayer coming from spirit and truth? What mighty specimens of its efficacy do we read, and hear, and believe! Old-world prayer, indeed, used to free from fires, and from beasts, and from famine; and yet it had not then received its form from Christ?'[16] Similar sayings are reported in the names of various scribes. R. Jose b. Halafta, who is an older authority than Tertullian, says: 'There are appointed times for prayer' (cf. Ps. 69. 14). Which time is the most favourable? When the community deliver their prayers.[17] Therefore must man rise early for prayers, for there is nothing greater than prayer. Do know, it was decreed concerning Moses that he should not enter the land, and not see it, Thanks to his prayers, God has shown him the land (cf. Deut. 34. 1). Hezekiah prayed, and the decree was annulled. So Jacob, in sending his sons to Egypt, prayed on their behalf.[18] R. Eleazar b. Pedath, who may be the author of the latter part of the saying, teaches: 'Great is prayer before God.' R. Eleazar says: 'Dost thou want to know the strength of prayer? If it does not accomplish the whole of it (*sc.* request), it does half of it.' The instance of Cain is illustrated, who owed it to his prayer that the נע of his punishment was forgiven, though

[16] v. also the Apology of Aristides, ch. xvi, Sirach uses the phrase, 'The prayer of the humble pierceth the clouds', 35. 17; v. Hebrew, 32. 14.

[17] As to the importance of communal prayers, v. Tr. Kallah, ch. R. Meir, ed. Coronel 16 A, b. Ber. 6 A, b. Ber. 8 A, R. Nathan מנין שאין הקב"ה מואס בתפלותן של רבים, b. Ber. 5 A, R. Joshua b. Levi to his son, ib., M. Prov. 10 B, ed. Stettin, R. Simon b. Johai, R. Johanan in his name.

[18] pal. Maccoth, ii. 9; Pes. B. 127 B; M. Ps. 65; M. Lam. s.v. סכותה; Tanh. B. i. 197. Some texts have b. Tahlifa, and without these instances.

the נוד (=נד) remained. As a second illustration there also the case of Hezekiah, who recovered from his illness and fifteen years were added to his life, is mentioned.[19] It was an accepted belief that prayers are useful and necessary, especially the prayers of the community. We read in another homily:[20] 'God hears all the prayers which are delivered in the same time. God's ears hear all the supplications and entreaties addressed to him!' It is one side of God's omnipotence. This is only possible with God, who is all-powerful. There may have been a more popular solution of this difficulty which answered it by applying an angelological doctrine. 'An angel is appointed over prayers. He collects them and gathers them. Making a crown of them he puts them on God's head.'[21] We note here in passing that *to crown* in Hellenistic phraseology is identical with to pray.[22] The angel to whom this function is allotted is called Sandalfon.[23] This extraordinary power of God is also the subject of another homily in the Tannaitic Midrash.[24] We have nineteen parallels drawn between the might of God (מי שאמר והיה העולם, or המקום) on one side, and the weakness of idols and men respectively on the other side. 'Idols have eyes, ears, nostrils, hands, legs,

[19] Deut. r. 8. 1; Pes. r. ch. 47, 188 B f., gives similar teachings and instances in the name of R. Juda b. Hijja, R. Joshua b. Levi, and R. Levi; v. also Gen. r. 22, Tanh. Sanhedrin 37 A, Lev. r. 10, Jeb. 64, jer. Ber. 9. 1, M. Ps. B. 475. Daniel's prayers, b. Ber. 31 A.

[20] M. P. 65. 2; B. 312; Exod. r. 21. 4.

[21] M. Ps. 19. 7; B. 167; R. Phinehas in the name of R. Abba; ib., 88. 2; B. 380; R. Phinehas; Exod. 21. 4; R. Phinehas in the name of R. Meir; R. Jeremiah in the name of R. Hijja b. Abba. Obviously in the first place the names of R. Meir, R. Jeremiah, and R. Hijja have been omitted.

[22] v. Gfrörer, *Urchristentum*, ii. 376; Dukes, *Zur Kenntnis der neuhebr. rel. Poesie*, Frankfort, 1842, 108.

[23] b. Hag. 13 B, הקושר כתרים לקונו; Deut. r. 2. 26. R. Berekhja says that Israel is called ten times כלה, corresponding to the ten garments of glory with which Israel crowns God; v. Cant. r. *s. v.* מה יפו דודיך, Jellinek, בה"מ, iii. 70; Qalir, Mahzor ר"ה i, ed. Heidenheim, מלך אזור; Yaik. Is. 506, Ps. 847.

[24] Mekh. 41 B; M. R. S. b. J. 66 f., fuller than the Mekh.; v. also 66 A, 69 A; Sifre Deut., § 233; the text is based on the M. R. S. b. J.

and cannot use them, men have thoughts and cannot control them. God, however, has none of these things; yet He sees everything at the same time (Zech. 4. 10, Prov. 15. 3), *He hears the prayers of all* (Ps. 65. 3, 10, 11), He accepts the sweet savour of the sacrifices, His hands created the Universe, He goes to war, and His thought is full of sweetness. God can utter two words at the same time, hear all the creatures praying at the same moment, fulfil the desires of all of them, their wishes for offspring, wisdom, and wealth, and grant them. His fear is greater on those who are near to Him than those who are far off. His creative power in forming the Universe and children of men is also unparalleled.' Here again in this remarkable homily great stress is laid on God's power. This is really the chief theme of this homiletical gem. The conception is laid down that with God it is possible to hear so many prayers and requests at the same time. The old Haggadist ignores or does not know that any intervention on the part of the angels is wanted. This wonderful thing is possible with God. God's power equals his immutability. But, does He not change His decrees at the prayers or signs of repentance on the part of the condemned or the wicked? Is there no contradiction between these two attributes? How shall we reconcile with this doctrine the often repeated idea that the prayers of the just remove or upset God's decrees? Is there no change in God's relation to his creatures caused by man's repentance and prayer? Are there not manifold instances in primitive and higher belief that owing to prayers, good deeds, and repentance God's judgement is altered? Our preacher treated these vexed questions rather lightly. When pointing out the third great attribute of the doctrine of God, His love and mercy, he apparently lost himself in contradictions. Love and mercy induce God, in spite of His general immutability, to change His plans and actions. There, he moved in a circle. Or, did he think of God's power as finite?

The general trend of rabbinic theology inclines to the

doctrine that God's decrees are subject to change. R. Johanan taught in the name of R. Jose b. Halafta: 'No word which went out from the mouth of God for good, even conditionally, was withdrawn.'[25] Only those which are for the good of the world, not so the decrees for evil and punishment, which are subject to alteration. An anonymous Haggadist[26] sees in God a father who condemned His son to death; then the son repented, and the father cleanses him of his sins. An older[27] source puts it that all the decrees for evil are put only conditionally, and are not fixed. God's decrees are, therefore, not changed, but originally made on condition. The saying of R. Eleazar that prayer, charity, and repentance remove all evil decrees, may also be understood in this sense.[28] Likewise the popular belief that the Zaddik annuls the decrees of God.[29] The Haggadists also like to contrast the power of a human king with God's. The former promises and decrees, and does not or cannot keep his words; God, however, גוזר ומקיים, decrees and keeps them.[30]

The Jewish doctrine of the all-powerful God met with severe criticism in the pagan world. Such a view was alien to the heathens, who were used to threaten and punish their gods in times of misfortune and disappointment. Romans, who saw the failures of the Jews in politics and war, could not suppress their contempt for the weakness of the God whose temple they destroyed, whose nation they crucified, whose land they devastated, whose state was low and miserable. They came to the conclusion: 'The God of the Jews is weak, and not omnipotent.' This state of mind is well reflected in the Titus legend, often repeated in our sources. Titus is supposed to enter the most sacred parts of the Temple accompanied by two harlots, tearing

[25] b. Ber. 7 A; v. also Tanh. B. תצוה 8; Pes. r. ch. 40; Yalk. Ps. 877, and Midr. Agada, B. 176, based on Ps. 119. 89.

[26] M. Ps. 82. [27] Sifre Zutta, Yalk. Deut., 813.

[28] Eccles. r. 7. 29; Pes. r. 200 B.

[29] v. Marmorstein, *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte u. Volkeskunde*, ii, pp. 351–362. [30] Pes. B. 30 and parall.

asunder the veil of the Holy of Holies, and asking: 'Where is the God who has slain Sisera and Sennacherib? I am in His dwelling-place, under his authority; well, let Him come and defeat me if He is really all-powerful?' On his homeward journey he met a terrific storm, and provokes the 'God of the Jews'. It seems to him that the God of the Jews has power over the water and storm. The generation of the flood, Pharaoh, perished by water. On the dry land, however, his power vanished; he is weak. God replies; 'Shall I fight with thee? No, I will send the smallest of my creatures, a despicable flea, and it will conquer thee!' *Abba Hanan* sees God's greatness and power in His long-suffering and patience with sinners like Titus.[31] This explanation is dependent on Ben Zoma's conception and idea of power and strength generally.[32]

It would, however, be a mistake to assume that only pagans held such views about God's power as ascribed to Titus. There must have been many Jews after 68 C.E., and after the catastrophe in the year 135, who doubted God's might. R. Eleazar b. Hyrkanos and R. Joshua b. Hananja actually repeat the words of their fellow Jews, who said: 'If God is the Lord of all works, just as He is our God, then we will acknowledge Him! If God is able to supply us with all our needs, we will obey Him!'[33] These words are quoted by these two Tannaim with reference to Exod. 17. 7 and attributed to the Israelites trembling before Amalek. Amalek is the Imperial Rome of the first century. The very words are repeated in the next generation by the contemporaries of R. Judah b. Ilai and R. Nehemia.[34] According to the latter source the Jews doubted the three cardinal attributes of God: the universalism, the omnipo-

[31] The Titus legend is preserved in Aboth R. N. i. 6, ii. 7; Gittin 56 B; Lev. r. 20. 5, 22. 6; Gen. r. 10. 8; M. Eccles. Zutta, 104; R. Aha, Eccles. r. 5. 9; M. Ps. 63 C; Lam. r. i. 32; Pirke ch. 49; Tanh. B. iv. 99; Num. r. 18. 22; Pugio 258; v. also I. Barukh 21. 20.

[32] Mishna Aboth iv. 4.

[33] Mekh. 52 B.

[34] Pes. B. 28 A; Tanh. B. v. 42 f. M. R. S. b. J. 81 reads instead of R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, R. Eleazar of Modiim.

tence, and the omniscience of God.] In another legend[35] again, a Roman, Tineius Rufus, says to the martyrs of Lydda, Julianus and Pappus, before they were about to be executed: 'He', i.e. God, 'cannot save you, as He saved the three young men, because He grew old since then, as it is said: "The Lord does not see, and the God of Jacob does not understand"' (Ps. 94. 7). The martyrs replied: 'They', i.e. the three young men, 'were pious, and the king also worthy that a miracle should be performed through them. Thou, however, art unworthy, and we also are not without guilt. There are many wild beasts that could or should put us to death at God's command. Thou art one of them!' The Roman dignitary, just like Titus in the legend, knew the history of the Jews in the last decades of the Temple and after the destruction, must have been convinced that the 'Jewish' God became weak, old, and helpless. Another martyr, though not of the Synagogue, but of the Church, Justin, corroborates these words of the Midrashim.[36] He says: 'Should some think, in case we acknowledge a God, who is able to help, well, we should not suffer by people, who are not just, we should not be tortured by them!' These doubts, felt and expressed by sceptics, must have been re-echoed by some contemporaries of the last Tannaim, otherwise we could not account for the fact that nearly all the teachers dealt with this subject. R. Simon b. Eleazar dwells at length on Num. 11. 23, 'Is it possible that Moses should say: "God (המקום) is unable to supply us and our cattle. The Nile in Egypt supplied us with fish, and there was also enough for the Egyptians and their cattle!"? No, that was not Moses' question. What he said was this: "Lord of all the worlds, is it right to do so, that Thou shouldst give them food, and afterwards slay them? Does one say to his friend: 'Take a loaf of bread, and go to Sheol'? Does one say to an ass: 'Take a khor of barley

[35] Sifra Emor 9; Eccles. r. 3. 6; Taanith, 18 B; Semahoth, ch. 8; Midrash Zutta, 98.

[36] *Apology*, ii. 5; v. Zöckler. *Apologetik*, 42.

and we will cut off thy head'?" God replied: "Is it better that they should say, 'God is unable to supply us with food'? Let them and hundreds like them perish, but My hand is never short to give even for a short while."'[37] This curious dialogue between God and Moses and the treatment of the doctrine of God's power surely reproduced the scepticism of the age. This accounts for the remarkable fact that nearly all the teachers of this age, the last three decades of the second century, deal with and elaborate this attribute of God. R. Nathan teaches: 'God said, "Even if all the magicians of the world gathered together and united their forces, they could not change day into night, and night into day. Just as I separated between light and darkness (*sc.* which no human power can alter any more), so did I sanctify Aaron."'[38] R. Simai uses the parable of the sun, asking: 'Have you ever heard that the sun is sick, and is unable to discharge his duties? that the moon is sick and unable to do her work? God's servants are free from weakness; can God Himself be sick?'[39] Bar Kappara teaches that God can make the impossible possible, the invisible visible.[40] Finally, Rabbi, i.e. R. Judah I, if our reading of the name is correct, repeats the parable of the sun, like R. Simon b. Johai and R. Simai, in order to demonstrate the doctrine of God's omnipotence.[41] Christians must have been taunted by the same arguments as Jews: 'If God is powerful, why does He not help?' R. Simon b. Johai, a contemporary of Justin Martyr and Tineius Rufus, repeats the parable of the sun to refute the attack on our doctrine.[42] 'Have you ever heard', asks the Haggadist,

[37] Tos. Sotah vi. 7, ed. Z. 305. 1 ff.

[38] Tanh. B. iv. 87.

[39] Pes. B. 130 A.; v. also further on, where it is quoted in the name of Simon b. Johai.

[40] M. Sam. ch. 9, ed. B. 74.

[41] v. Mekh. 72 B. The text reads: ומה [שמש] אחד משמשי שמשין הרי הוא בא במקומו ושלא במקומו ק'ו לכבודו של מי שאמר והיה העולם 'In spite of the omnipresence of God, we can speak of God's descent and Moses's ascent; everything is possible with God'.

[42] Lam. r. 2. 23, ed. B. 5. 9; r. R. Isaac, and the moon is substituted for the sun; v. also above, in the name of R. Simai.

'of the sun being ill? or being too weak in discharging its duties? God's servant cannot become ill, or weak, or old; how can such a thing be thought of God Himself?' These instances, which are taken from the Apologies of Rabbis, and can easily be multiplied, prove plainly that some Jews and Gentiles alike must have raised serious doubts as to the omnipotence of God. Our purpose in treating this point at some length is to throw light on an otherwise surprising idea in connexion with our subject. We read in many Midrashim the teaching that as long as Edom, or Amalek, rules in this world the Kingdom of Heaven, the Name of God, or His Throne is not complete, firm, or absolute.[43] Here, again, the tendency of the finite power, which God seems to have, ruled in the theology of the third century. We observe similar ways of thinking of the doctrine of God's Unity, which can be here merely alluded to. God's Unity will be perfect only in the future, when all nations will live as citizens of the heavenly kingdom. The Unity of God is, therefore, at present limited to Israel and the pious believers in God among the nations. God's power is also limited by His heavenly Court, as we have mentioned above. These points are reserved left for discussion in the chapter treating the Unity of God.

The attribute of God's power is closely connected with God's Unity, with the problem of Dualism and consequently also with that of God's character as Creator of man and the Universe. The latter point must be treated in the chapter of God's relation to both man and the world. Here, before closing this discussion of the doctrine of God's omnipotence, one problem must be touched: God's power to produce miracles. How are the supernatural miracles, like the dividing of the Red Sea, and Jordan, &c. to be explained? If changes of the laws of nature are possible, the doctrine of God's immutability is also threatened.

[43] The teaching is ascribed to R. Hama b. Hanina and R. Abba b. Kahana; Pes. B. 29B; Pes. r. ch. 12; M. Ps. 10B; Tanhuma; v. Marmorstein, *Midrash Haseroth witheroth*, p. 27, note 106.

The belief in miracles and wonders, whether natural or supernatural, was general in the ages of the Tannaitic and Amoraic teacher.[44] The miracles served the purpose of sanctifying God's name and of making His name great and recognized among the nations.[45] Doubts and negations were expressed as to the truth of the Biblical wonders.[46] Some of the teachers repelled scepticism by the favourite theory that the just in this world perform similar deeds; they revive the dead, heal the sick, bless the barren, &c. If human beings are able to do so, how much more God Himself.[47] R. Judah b. Simon taught with reference to the great changes in the world to come, to the eschatological wonders, that such great things were already performed by the pious in this world.[48] The greatest of the wonders to be performed is the resurrection from death.[49] There is a consensus of opinion that Almighty God in His power can and will accomplish such a miracle. This belief, joined with the dogma of God giving or withholding rain in due season, is regarded as the גבורות especially. Both dogmas comprise together the second number of the Eighteen Benedictions.

There were teachers who displayed a more rationalistic tendency regarding this problem. R. Johanan and R. Jeremiah b. Eliezer,[50] inclining to a conception of a finite power of God, teach that the rending of the sea, the bowing of the heavens before Moses (Deut. 32. 1), the standing still of sun and moon in the time of Joshua, the feeding of Elijah by the ravens, the escape of the three young men

[44] v. Lev. r. 10. 8; R. Judah b. Ilai, Exod. r. 18. 8, Eccl. r. 3. 17; R. Simon b. Lakish, Gen. r. 5. 4, M. Ps. 18. 6; R. Simon b. Judah, Cant. r. 3. 4; R. Eleazar b. Pedath, Tanh. i. לך לך, 9; R. Simon b. Lakish, Cant. r. 1. 5; R. Berekhja, Gen. r. 43. 4; R. Judah and R. Nehemjah, Taan. 25 A; R. Hanina b. Dosa, Taan. 21 A; Nahum of Gimso.

[45] Sifre Deut., § 306, 132 B.

[46] R. Simon b. Lakish; v. Num. r. chap. 17.

[47] Deut. 10. 3; v. Jellinek בהמ', iii. 69. 77.

[48] Gen. r. 77. 1.

[49] v. the material collected, Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of the Resurrection*, in 'Journal of American Theology', 1915, pp. 577–591.

[50] Gen. r. 5. 4; Exod. r. 21. 6; Midr. Konen; Marmorstein, *Midr. Has. witheroth*, p. 39.

from the fire, of Daniel in the lion's den, the opening of the Heavens to Ezekiel, and the saving of Jonah in the whale, were all laid down as conditions at the creation of the world. God stipulated with fire and water, lions and whales, that they should change their nature on these occasions. Nature does not change, but they were ordered from the beginning so as to provide for these miracles. The whole world was created only conditionally, if Israel accepts the Torah or not.[51]

(4) *The Eternity of God.*

R. Simai, a teacher of the latter period of the Tannaim, prayed: 'Lord of all creatures, God of all praises, Rock of the worlds, the everlasting Creator of the Universe, who quickenest again the death.'[1] It seems natural to assume that the attribute of God's Eternity is a consequence of His power, or that the latter is an outcome of the fact that God is eternal, or the life of the world. It is an everlasting merit of the Rabbinic theologians that they reopened the older prophetic conception and, without any reservation, taught the Eternity of God. Whatever may have been believed in Old Israel in the pagan period of the Jewish people about growing and perishing, reviving and decaying gods, Judaism left and kept no traces of such religious aspects. This is another deep contrast between monotheism and polytheism, in which the former excels the latter, in spite of the fact that Christianity could not entirely free itself from the influence of the latter. The names of God mentioned in the prayer of R. Simai contain also חי העולם, which may mean 'the Life of the World' or 'the Everlasting'. More frequent than this is the term חי העולמים. R. Johanan b. Zakkai wept when his pupils surrounded the master's death-bed in the last hour of his life. They were surprised, and asked: 'Light of Israel, right pillar, strong hammer, wherefore dost thou weep?'

[51] *Midrash Haseroth*, p. 39, note 162.

[1] pal. Ber. 1. 5.

R. J. b. Z. said: 'If I were carried before an earthly king, who is here to-day and to-morrow in his grave, if he were angry it would not last for ever, if he would bind me and kill me, it could not be for ever; moreover, I could appease him with words, or bribe him with money, yet I would surely cry. Now that I am about to appear before the King of all kings, who lives and exists for all generations, whose anger, punishment, and sentence of death are eternal, who cannot be bribed by words or money, should I not tremble and fear?'[2] The belief in an everlasting God could not be expressed in a more impressive way than in these words of the departing scribe. Another scribe ordered, when mentioning God, the righteous, the everlasting righteous, to bless Him.[3] The ark of God, the Everlasting (חי העולמים) was carried during the journey in the wilderness next to the ark of Joseph, and people asked: מה טיבו של מת להלוך עם ארון חי העולמים.[4] The blessing at drinking water is, to Him who created many souls and supplied their needs, 'for all that Thou hast created', and who is 'Everlasting'.[5] R. Eleazar of Modiim praises a scholar who had heard the word of the law from his teacher, and regards him as if he had served, ministered before Him, who lives and exists for ever.[6] The prohibition of idolatry is extended to all generations from the word על פני (Exod. 20. 3). Just as God lives and exists for ever, similarly the prohibition of idolatry holds good for everlasting generations.[7] Moses[8] rebukes his people for being rebellious against or before חי וקיים לעולמים. We see that the Tannaitic Haggada frequently emphasizes this doctrine.

[2] b. Ber. 28 B.

[3] Mekh. 19 B. 7: ר' אומר זכר צדיק לברכה כשהוא מזכיר את הצדיק צדיק חי העולמים שנ' צדיק ה' בכל דרכיו תן ברכה אז; v. b. Yoma 37 A, Hananjahu, the nephew of R. Joshua b. Hananja: אמר להם נביא לישראל כשאני מזכיר צדיק עולמים אתם תנו ברכה צדיק חי עולמים. Talkut Exod. 219, agrees with ed. Mekh.

[4] Mekh. 24 B; Sotah 13 A and Parall.

[5] Mekh. 31 B; b. Ber. 44 A; Tosefta and Parall.

[6] Mekh. 46 A; v. also Sifre Deut., § 41: בשומע מפי הקב'ה.

[7] Mekh. 67 B. [8] Mekh. 48 A.

R. Judah b. Ilai uses the name of God חי העולמים in explaining the geographical name באר לחי ראי (Gen. 16. 14).[9] Bar Kappara joins it with צדיק, speaking of צדיק חי העולמים, about whom sectarians talk blasphemies.[10] We find also the term כבוד חי עולמים, the Glory of the Everlasting just as the Everlasting Righteous.[11]

R. Tanhum b. Hanilai developed R. Johanan b. Zakkai's teaching, and adapted it in his homily on Ps. 12. 7: 'A king, flattered by the eulogies of the city, promises them town halls, public buildings and baths, and water supply. He goes to rest in the evening, and does not awake any more. Where is he, and where his promises? Not so God. He is a truthful God' (Jer. 10. 10). Why is He truthful? R. Levi says: 'Because He is a *living* and *everlasting* God.[12] The teacher combines here, as in other cases also, two different attributes, e.g. Truth and Eternity. R. Levi illustrates a similar antithesis between God and the idols.[13] R. Joshua b. Levi depicts Pharaoh first searching the scrolls containing the divine names of tribal and national deities, of Moab, Amon, Edom, and Zidon &c., and afterwards unable to discover the names of the God of the Hebrews. R. Levi illustrates this with a parable. 'There was once a priest who owned a slave. The priest had to leave for another place without the knowledge of the slave. The latter went about looking for his master, and sought also in the cemetery. People asked him: 'Who is your master?' The slave replied: 'So and so, the priest!' People said: 'You fool! you are looking for a priest in the cemetery?' Thus Pharaoh. He sought God in his dead scrolls. 'The gods in your hand are dead ones; our God is alive, and exists for ever' (v. Jer. 10. 10). In another source[14] R. Levi depicts a father, who lost his son, and was looking for him in the cemetery. A clever man meets him, and asks: 'Was your lost son alive or dead?' The Father replies: 'Alive!' The stranger says:

[9] Gen. r., pp. 654, 661, ed. Theodor.
[10] Gen. r. 1. 7. [11] Gen. r. 100. 6; R. Isaac.
[12] Pes. B. 30 B; Tanh. iv. 104, R. Abin instead of R. Levi; Lev. r. 26. 1.
[13] Tanh. ii. 18. [14] Lev. r. 6. 6.

'You fool! is it customary to look for the dead among the living, or the living among the dead? The living provide for the necessities of the dead; do the dead care and toil for the living?' Likewise, continues the preacher, our God is living, and exists to all eternities. The gods of the nations of the world are dead (cf. Ps. 115. 3 ff.), 'and we forsake the Everlasting and worship the dead?' Here R. Abba b. Kahana teaches that 'everything perishes; only God remains alive'.[15] 'Man's work lives longer than its maker, God lives longer than His work'.[16] An illustration of the former is given in the names of cities built by or named after Constantine, Antiochus, Romulus, Alexander or Tiberius and Seleucus. 'They perished, their cities are destroyed, but God remains alive and exists.'[17]

(5) *Truth.*

The next attribute of God we have to describe, based on our sources, is that of Truth. God is called אלהים אמת (Jer. 10. 10, Ps. 15. 2, 31. 6, 119. 160). We find also in an Egyptian hymn the designation, 'The Lord of Truth'.[1] In Rabbinic theology this attribute is connected with God's eternity. He, who is eternal can be true, trustworthy, faithful to His creatures. A mortal being is unable, often prevented from discharging his duties.[2] Owing to God's eternity such a state of affairs cannot arise. There was a man, says an Haggadist,[3] whose countrymen used to deposit with him their articles. In spite of his best intentions, he is apt to make mistakes, because he does not know

[15] Lev. r. 19. 2; v. 1. Sam. 2. 2; Tanh. iii. 33.
[16] R. Judah b. Menasja, b. Meg. 14 A.
[17] M. Ps. 9. 8, ed. Buber, 85.
[1] v. Breasted, pp. 347, 351; cf. Farnell, *Attributes*, p. 107.
[2] v. above, p. 178.
[3] M. Ps. 25. 2, ed. B. 210; v. also R. Alexander's exposition, who develops this idea of God's truth on the assumption of God's tenderness and love to his creatures: בשר ודם מפקידין בידו חדשים והוא מחזירן בלויין ישינים אבל הקב"ה מפקידין בידו בלויין ושחוקין והוא מחזירן חדשים.

the articles. God is different; He is the God of Truth (Ps. 31. 6), 'In Thy hand do I trust my spirit'. Did it ever happen that God interchanged the souls entrusted to Him? No, he returned them to their rightful owners, for 'He is a trustworthy God'. Since God is omniscient such a mistake is with Him excluded. The doctrines of immortality and the future redemption of Israel are based, to a great extent, on the belief that human souls are nightly deposited with God, who faithfully returns them every morning. This act of truthfulness is a symbol of their eschatological expectations.[4] 'God's seal is Truth' is a teaching of R. Hanina b. Hama.[5] The word אמת is explained after the Notarikon fashion to imply a protest against Gnostic dualism and Christological ideas. The א means God is the first, and not the Demiurgos; ת the last (He has no successor), and מ, besides Him there is none.[6] An allegorist sees in all the characteristics of Ps. 15 an allusion to God. Similarly ודובר אמת 'He who speaketh the truth, is God' (cf. Jer. 10. 10).[7] R. Isaac[8] uses Ps. 119. 160 for the explanation of Gen. 1. 1 and as a refutation of dualistic theories. God's word is Truth, i.e. 'God created in the beginning heaven and earth'. R. Isaac b. Merjon connects also truth with Eternity when he expounds Hab. 2. 4: אפילו צדיק חי העולמים מאמונתו הוא חי 'Even the Righteous Eternal lives from His Truth, Faithfulness'.[9] The attribute of God's truth is also the basis of the belief in reward and punishment. God is truthful, and He will reward the just and punish the wicked. The Tannaitic Midrash sees in אני ה of the text this doctrine expressed. The inner bearing of these two doctrines is brought home to students of Rabbinic lore in a story of Simon b. Shetach. This teacher bought once an ass from an Ishmaelite.

[4] v. Gen. r. 48, 1; Lam. r. 3. 22; M. Ps. 25. 2; R. Alexander and Simon R. b. Abba in the name of R. Simon.

[5] b. Shabbath 55 A; Yoma 69 B; Sanh. 64 A: חותמו של הקב"ה אמת.

[6] v. pal. Ber 1. 5.

[7] M. Ps. 15. 4, ed. B. 116.

[8] Gen. r. 1. 7.

[9] Eccles. r. 3. 9; v. however Bacher, A. P. A. iii. 590; the passage remains obscure.

The pupils of the master found a jewel on the neck of the animal. The pupils saw in this event a blessing of the Lord, and suggested to him to keep the ass with the jewel. The scribe thought otherwise; he said: 'I bought an ass, and not a jewel.' Simon b. Shetach duly returned it, and the Ishmaelite said: 'Blessed be the God of Simon b. Shetach.' Behold from the reliability, trustworthiness of man, thou canst learn that of God, who is faithful to reward Israel for the observance of the commandments.[10] Similar events are recorded in the stories told about great men of antiquity like R. Hanina b. Dosa, R. Phinehas b. Jair. The moral of the narratives was מאמונתו של בשר ודם את יודע אמונתו של הקב"ה.[11] If the words of a human being can be relied upon, though its fulfilment seems impossible or supernatural, how much more, argued the Rabbis, can we accept God's promises and threats as being trustworthy.

(6) *Justice.*

The attribute of Justice is even more closely attached to God's Eternity than Truth by the Haggadic theologians. This is manifested in the name צדיק חי עולמים, and is, as we saw, based on the conception of God's truthfulness. The justice of God appears in His character and name of Judge, 'Lord of Judgement', as a source of law and order, as the revealer of the moral, social, and political duties, and master of rewards and punishment. Many first-rate theological problems and teachings depend on this attribute.

Heretics and heathens, readers of the Bible and philosophers, seem to have had a special pleasure in finding fault with God's justice and impartiality. They referred to and cited Abraham's question: 'Should not the judge of the whole earth do justice?' (Gen. 18. 25). God could give no answer. Abraham asked also: 'Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked?' (ib. 23). God kept silent.

[10] Deut. r. 3. 5 and following note.

[11] b. Jeb. 121 A; v. pal. Demai, ch. 1; B. M., ch. 2; Deut. 3. 5.

A Haggadist dealt with these questions, which were left without answers, in a homily based on Job 40. 4, 'I will not keep silent, so that people should not say: "We can also speak with God", i.e. and criticize Him, as Abraham did, and He could not defend Himself'. God replies: 'No, I will not keep quiet; I did not answer Abraham, yet I will answer thee. Why? Because Abraham did not doubt my truthfulness and justice, when I enjoined him to sacrifice his son Isaac, although I told him previously that Isaac will be called his seed' (Gen. 21. 12).[1] Abraham, owing to his strong faith in God's justice, was entitled to raise such questions. The same right cannot be conceded to those who deny or doubt God's justice, or the vain-glorious gossipers who judge the Highest by their limited or superficial wisdom. The idea in this Haggada illustrates the thought that God knows why He has chosen Abraham, why He enriched and exalted him, whilst others were neglected, poor, and humble. There is no arbitrariness with God but strict judgement.[2] If some tell thee: 'God makes rich and poor; whom He likes He makes rich, others He makes poor. One becomes a king, the other a beggar; Abraham becomes a king and rich!' Reply to him: 'Could you accomplish those deeds which Abraham accomplished?' The same problem is met with in a dialogue between the Matrona and R. Jose b. Halafta: 'Your God', says the lady, 'chooses whomsoever He likes!' i.e. is not just. The scribe, instead of replying directly, passed on to her a basket of figs. The lady selected the nicest and ripest of them and enjoyed them. The scribe, looking at what she was doing, observed: 'You are clever in selecting the good figs out of the bad ones, and you assume that God does not know whom He has chosen as the best of His creatures!'[3]

A more serious discussion of this great and puzzling question is to be found in another dialogue between the

[1] Tanh. B. i. 91; Agadath Ber. B. 44.

[2] Gen. r. 55. 1.

[3] Num. r. 3. 2 and parall; v. Tobit 4. 19.

Emperor and R. Joshua b. Hananja.[4] 'Where is your God's sense of justice? Why are children born deaf and dumb, blind and lame? Why should they suffer? They are innocent.' R. Joshua replied: 'God knows the deeds of man long before he was born, whether he is going to be good or bad.' Emperor: 'Let him repent, and God shall open his eyes!' Thereupon R. Joshua tests the case of a blind man, who turns out to be a greedy, faithless man, and convinces the Emperor of God's justice. The attribute of justice was and is a stumbling-block to all who look upon great and small events merely from a narrow and selfish point of view. Daily life and common happenings appear in a light, which can hardly be reconciled with God's justice. The old question: 'Why is the wicked prosperous and the righteous man miserable?' is not yet answered. R. Joshua, a thinker of great eminence, has no other answer than this, that God in His omniscience knows what He does. This teaching could not satisfy. As a matter of fact some teachers of the third century held just the contrary view. God judges man not according to his future actions but on his present deeds, worth, and merits.[5] R. Isaac taught: 'If one tells you, "I have sought and could not find!" do not believe him. "I did not seek, but I have found!" do not believe him. "I sought and I found", then believe him.'[6] Rabbinic opinions are at variance whether blessings of life, like health, wealth, and children, or poverty, illness, and barrenness, are a result of piety or wickedness, merits or sins, or independent of such qualities or faults. The problem was discussed at all times

[4] S. E. Z. ch. 23, ed. Friedmann, 41.

[5] j. R. H. 1. 3, 57 A; R. Joshua b. Levi: אין הקב"ה דן את האדם אלא בשעה שהוא עומד בה; v. also Gen. r. 53; Th. 572; Exod. r. 3. 2; Tanh. Ps. Jon.; Gen. 21. 16; b. R. H. 16 B. The same idea in the *Logia of Jesus*, v. 10; v. Harnack, *Erforschtes u. Erlebtes*, Giessen, 1923, 50, 'Wherein I find you, therein will I judge you'. God does not judge man after his past or future, but as he is in the present; v. also Marmorstein, in *ZfNW*, 28 (1926), 257 f.

[6] b. Meg. 6 B; Tanh. f. 280 B.

without reaching a final answer.[7] R. Isaac advises people to seek and they will find. Apparently by his saying he refers to students of the law. Can it be also the same with seekers after wealth and happiness? The Gospels quote a similar saying: 'Seek ye and ye shall find!'[8] or 'He who seeks findeth'.[9] Speculation, philosophical as well as theological, has failed to answer this simple question up to to-day. They were not happier in the solution of the bigger problems of suffering and death, success and health of individuals as well as of nations. Rome, i.e. Edom, is successful and rich, Israel is poor and down-trodden. Rome enjoys the blessing of Isaac, his father.[10] Israel's suffering, poverty, exile, are all signs of God's love, of God's guidance. The happiness of the wicked is merely a faint dream of the future joy of the righteous; the might of God's enemies merely a shadow of Israel's future greatness and glory. One or two teachings testify to God's justice. The first is that God rewards the just and punishes the wicked. The second, that neither human life, nor the history of the world, whether in their darkest moments or at the height of their glory, can be thought of without, or divided from, God's providence. Therefore, whatever happens, must be according to a wise plan, and is just. Hence the doctrine of the great Day of Judgment depicted by prophets and apocalyptics, and elaborated by the Haggadists. We are here especially interested in a saying of R. Johanan b Nappaha: 'God will in future sit in judgement over pious and wicked alike. The former go to the Garden of Eden, the latter to Hell. The wicked protest by saying: "God has not judged us properly. Whomsoever He likes, He justifies, and whom He dislikes He declares guilty." God says: "I did not want to publish your crimes." What does

[7] v. the material in my *The Doctrine of Merits*, 34; cf. W. Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 432: 'Prosperity and fertility, whether of man, beast, or crop, depend on the Roman's attitude towards his deities.'

[8] Matt. 7. 7.

[9] Ib. v. 8; v. *MGWJ.* 41, 74, and Hoenicke, *Neutest. Apokryphen*, p. 218, and *Handbuch*, 37.

[10] v. *The Doctrine of Merits*, Index, s.v. 'Rome'.

God do? He causes their *elogium* to be read, and they go to Hell.'[11] An earlier Haggadist, R. Jonathan b. Eliezer, taught[12] that God does not condemn a nation before he caused their books to be read aloud in Heaven. This gave rise to the conception of the heavenly books of virtues and crimes, preserved in Heaven. This doctrine made a great impression on the popular mind, and is one which contributed a great deal to misrepresent the general trend of Rabbinic theology.[13] The same teacher, R. Jonathan, taught further that no wicked departed from this world until he saw or experienced his own downfall.[14] R. Hanina b. Hama strongly opposed those who held that God never punishes; 'He forgives all sins, no; He is long-suffering, but He pays for all sins.'[15] This sounds like the saying of Sextus Empiricus, who resembles in many of his sayings the Rabbis:

'Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small;
Though with patience He stands waiting, with exactness grinds He all.'

At this point we arrive at the conflict between the attributes of justice and goodness, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

The individual tragedies and communal misfortunes which befell Jews gave rise frequently to discussions and observations on the meaning and origin of suffering. When the four Elders, e.g. R. Tarphon, R. Joshua b. Hananja, R. Eleazar b. Azarja, and R. Akiba entered the sick room of R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, R. Akiba said: 'Beloved are the sufferings!' The master said to them: 'Support me; I will hear the words of my pupil, Akiba, who says that

[11] M. Ps. ch. 1, B. 24

[12] Gen. r., ch. 28; Th. 259; Midr. Sam., ch. 18.

[13] v. also Tanh., B. i. 11 A; Steinschneider, *Kobak's Jeschurun*. iii. 65; Ozar Nehmad. ii. 113; Sachs, *M. Beiträge*, i. 11; Zunz, *Jubelschrift*, p. 145, Löwenthal, *Ps. Aristoteles*, p. 126. 1.

[14] Esther r., ch. 3, 13 B: אין הרשע יוצא מן העולם עד שהקב"ה מראה קניגין דידיה היאך הוה מיתציד.

[15] Esther r., ch. 8, 24 B, ch. 7, 24 B: מאן דאמר רחמנא ותרן הוא יתותרון מעוהי; Tanh., f. 126 B; M. Ps. 10 D, ed. B. 93.

sufferings are precious! Akiba, whence do you derive this teaching?' Akiba replied: 'I derive it from the plain text of the Scriptures! It says: "Manasseh was twelve years old when he began to reign, and he reigned fifty-five years in Jerusalem, &c., and he did evil in the sight of the Lord!" (2 Kings 21. 1–2) Further it says, "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, copied out" (Prov. 25. 1). Is it possible that Hezekiah, who taught the whole world Torah, should have neglected the education of his own son, Manasseh? No, in spite of all the great trouble and pain Hezekiah took with his son, only sufferings brought him (Manasseh) back to the right path, as it is said: "And the Lord spake to Manasseh and to his people; but they would not hearken. Wherefore the Lord brought upon them the captains of the host of the King of Assyria, which took Manasseh among the thorns, and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon. And when he was in affliction he besought the Lord his God, and humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers" (2 Chron. 33. 10–12). Hence thou dost learn that sufferings are beloved.'[16] At the same time, or another like occasion, the Scribes wept bitterly, but R. Akiba smiled. When the patient said: 'There is a mighty anger in the world!' the Scribes cried, for 'the Scroll of Torah' was in pain. R. Akiba, however, said: 'I smile, for all the time that I see my master without trouble, that his wine, his flax, his oil, his honey is good and well, I am afraid, lest my master "has already received his world"; now that I see his pain I smile, because I am sure that he has not lost his share in the world to come.'[17] R. Akiba was the first to emphasize the teaching that God makes the righteous pay in this world for the few 'evil deeds' which they have committed, in order to bestow upon them happiness and give them a good reward in the world to come. Just the opposite is the case with the reward and punishment of the wicked.[18] Sufferings are, according to R. Akiba,

[16] Mekh. 72 B; Sifre Dt., § 32; b. Sanh. 101 B. [17] Ib. 101 A.
[18] Gen. r. 33. 1; Pes. B. 73 A; Lev. r. 27; Agad. Ber. 4.

signs of God's justice and love. It is remarkable how often this great teacher recurs to this subject. In the refutation of Pappus's sermons R. Akiba retorts: 'There is no arbitrariness in God's deeds. The words of Him "who spake, and the world was created", cannot be refuted. He judges everything in truth and in justice!'[19] Justice and love are God's thrones.[20] The great, almost unbearable, sufferings which Jews endured in this teacher's age, supply us with the commentary on these sayings. We have to thank God for the good and evil alike. The latter are signs of the Divine love and grace. The teachers made an impression in this age upon the visitors to the schools and places of worship by saying: 'Man should welcome suffering more than happiness (טובה), for if man is happy he cannot acquire forgiveness of sin; how does he acquire it? By suffering!'[21]

Seven contemporaries of the Bar-Kokhba war expressed their opinions on this problem. R. Eliezer b. Jacob refers to Prov. 3. 12, 'For whom the Lord loveth He correcteth; even as a father the son in whom he delighteth'. What causeth the father to delight in his son? The sufferings. R. Meir refers to Deut. 8. 5, 'Thou shalt also know in thine heart, that, as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee'. 'Thou and thine heart are aware of the deeds thou hast done, and the sufferings by which I have chastened thee. The chastisements were not in accordance with thy deeds.' R. Meir means to say that our sufferings are always less than what we really deserve. R. Jose b. Judah exclaims: 'Beloved are the sufferings before God! (המקום), for, through them the glory of God falls upon him who is being chastened.' R. Jonathan b. Joseph says that, 'just as God made a covenant with the Holy Land, He did so likewise with the sufferings'. That means to say: 'God fulfilled His promise to bring our forefathers into the Land, so He will keep His promise to pay reward in the world to come for the good deeds and sufferings in this

[19] Mekh. 33 A. [20] b. Hag. 14 A; cf. Dan. 7. 9.
[21] Mekh. 72 B; Sifre Deut., § 32; M. Tan. 26.

world'. R. Simon b. Johai calls the sufferings 'beloved' (חביבים), for God gave three things to Israel, which the nations of the world eagerly desire, e. g. the Law, the Land of Israel, and the world to come. All the three were given with sufferings. The Torah (cf. Prov. 1. 2 and 5. 12), Palestine (Deut. 8. 5), and the future life (Prov. 6. 22). R. Nehemiah looks on sufferings as on the sacrifices. Both of them atone for sins. Moreover, chastisements have a greater atoning power than sacrifices. The latter affect men's money, the former men's body, life, health.[22] R. Judah b. Ilai depicts the righteous giving praise and thanks, seeing the retribution of the wicked, for the sufferings brought on them (the righteous) in this world (Lev. r. 32. 1). R. Eliezer b. Parta goes even a step further when saying that God stipulated with Israel at the revelation: 'If ye receive upon yourselves the chastisements (for transgressing the law) with joy, then ye will receive reward; if not, if ye murmur against them, then they will change into punishments. They, therefore, received the punishments with joy'.[23]

The sufferings which were the sources of these teachings repeatedly occurred in the third century. The problem did not lose force and actuality. R. Jochanan b. Nappaha visited his pupils and friends, R. Hijja b. Abba and R. Eleazar b. Pedath. In both cases he asked: 'Do you love your pain and suffering?' The same question was asked of R. Johanan by R. Hanina b. Hama. In all the three instances the answer given was: 'No, neither sufferings nor their reward!'[24] The answers are the more remarkable since the great teachers of the second century decided that sufferings have to be borne with love and patience.[25] R. Jochanan very

[22] v. Sifre Deut., § 32; Mekh. 72 B; M. Ps. 417–18; M. Tann. 26; b. Ber. 5 A.

[23] Mekh. 63 B; Aboth R. Nathan, 47 A. [24] b. Ber. 5 B.

[25] B. Ber. 5 A; Cant. r. on 2. 16, with variants. The latter text throws light on the Babylonian report. The Bab. text reads: ר׳ יוחנן חלש על לגביה ר׳ חנינא א״ל חביבין עליך יסורין א״ל לא הן ולא שכרן א׳ל הב לי ידך ויהב ליה ידיה ואוקמיה אמאי לוקים ר׳ יוחנן לנפשיה אמרו אין חבוש מתיר עצמו מבית האסורים. R. Jochanan became ill. R. Hanina, who

often dealt with the problem of suffering. 'God visits with pain those who are soft-hearted.' In another saying he speaks of the potter who examines his pots. He does not knock at the bad ones, but on the good ones. He knocks many times, and they do not break. God likewise does not chastise the wicked (מנסה examine by illness, trouble, &c.). On whom does He cause suffering? The righteous, as it is said: 'The Lord tests the just' (Ps. 11. 5).[26] That sufferings

was by profession a medical man, went to visit him. R. Hanina asked the patient: 'Do you like sufferings?' R. Jochanan said: 'No, I do not like them nor their reward.' R. H.: 'Give me your hand.' R. J. did so, and was healed. 'Why did not R. J. raise himself?' Because no prisoner can free himself without other people's help from the prison. The version preserved in Cant. r. shows that a good deal is missing in this relation. R. Jochanan suffered, according to that version, for three years and a half from צמר מורייה (fever). R. Hanina went to visit him, and said to the patient: 'What is with thee?' (lit. מה אית עליך 'What is upon thee?') R. J. replied: 'I have more on me than I can bear!' R. H.: 'Thou must not speak thus, but say: 'The faithful God!' When his (R. J.'s) pain became very great, he said so. Once it became greater than usual. R. Hanina again visited the sick, and he said a word (אמר עלוי מלה) and the sick was at ease (והוה נסב נפש). After many days R. Hanina became ill, and R Jochanan went to visit him, and said: 'What is with thee?' R. H. replied: 'How hard are the pains!' R. J.: 'But how great their reward!' R. H.: 'I do not like them nor their reward.' R. J.: 'Why dost thou not say that word which thou didst say to me and thou wilt be at ease?' R. H.: 'When I was outside I stood as surety for others; now that I am inside others have to pledge themselves for my sake.' R. J. said: 'It is written, "he feedeth among the lilies", that means that the staff of God touches only such men (Cant. 2. 16), whose heart is tender like the lilies.' The three and a half years of R. Jochanan's illness remind us of the general use of this number, e. g. Dan. 7. 25; 8. 13, 14; 9. 27; 12. 7, 12, 11 f.; vgl. Hilgenfeld, *Apokalyptik*, 27; *Apocalypse of Elijah*, 87; R. Jochanan; M. Ps. 10 D: ג' שנים ומחצה כד הוינא מלבר היתה שכינה עומדת בהר הזתים ומברזת הוינא ערב לאחרונין ובדון דאנא מלגיו לית אנא בעי אחורנין דיערבוני agrees with the saying אין חבוש מתיר עצמו מבית האסורים. It is clear that this was said by R. Hanina, and not by R. Jochanan, as assumed by the Babylonian text. An outsider can stand surety or bail for the prisoner who is inside, and not *vice versa*.

[26] Cant. r. on 2. 16; v. however Gen. r. ch. 32. 3, ed. Th. 290, in the name of R. Jonathan b. Eliezer; v. also ch. 34. 2 and 55. 2; Tanh. וירא 20, the same in the name of R. Judah b. Shalom. The potter is often mentioned in Rabbinic parables; v. Gen. r. 14. 7; v. Sirach 33. 12; Test. Naph., § 2; cf. Aphraates, 386.

are brought on the righteous when they have a chance to study the Torah and they neglect it, is another teaching of R. Jochanan. His colleague, R. Simon b. Lakish, put it this way: 'Suffering departs from him who studies the Torah'.[27] Sufferings are, according to both, means and agents by which our sins are removed and wiped out. They are signs of love or of God's covenant with men.[28] We may find a clue to these sayings in the dispute of R. Jacob b. Idi and R. Aha b. Hanina. Both older pupils of R. Jochanan and contemporaries of R. Simon b. Lakish. They speak of sufferings of love. This term depends upon whether neglect of study, or of prayer, is entailed or not. We know that the persecutions in R. Johanan's time were aimed, in the first instance against the study of the Law and performance of the commandments. Jews in Galilee were burdened with communal slavery, police work, and other tiresome services, so that they were unable to perform their religious obligations. Besides the strenuous physical work, they were worried by conscientious troubles. There is a great resemblance between the conditions prevailing before and after the Bar-Kokhba war on one side, and in the middle of the third century on the other side. Now, just as then, the problem of the suffering, especially of the just, was the order of the day. Therefore, many other teachers of this age also deal with the cause and meaning of suffering. Thus, R. Joshua b. Levi says: 'He who rejoices at the sufferings which befall him, will bring salvation to the whole world, as it is said, "Through them (sufferings) will the world be saved"' (Isa. 64. 4).[29] Entirely in the spirit of this age rings another saying of the same teacher: 'All sufferings which befall a man and disturb him from study are sufferings of rebuke, otherwise they are sufferings of love'. We have seen that

[27] b. Ber. 5 A.

[28] AZ. 55 A; Ib. 5 A; Deut. r. 2; v. also Menahoth, 53 B.

[29] B. Taan. 8 A: כל השמח ביסורין שבאין עליו מביא ישועה לעולם שנ' בהם עולם ונושע.

R. Jochanan did not agree with this view, 'All sufferings are signs of love'.[30] R. Alexander says: 'There is no one without suffering'. It is a fallacy to assume that the wicked are absolutely happy. Righteous and wicked, good and bad people, suffer equally under the foreign rulers, who enslave men and women for their statute-labour. 'Happy is the man who suffers, or upon whom suffering comes on account of the Torah'. That, surely, means to say that the prohibition or the neglect of study causes him pain and suffering.[31] Owing to slavery, in the day-time the scholars were prevented from study by day, and had to use the hours of the night for this purpose. This is the reason why the duty of study is so emphatically urged by the teachers of this age, and the greatness of the study in the night exaggerated.

A third teacher, R. Jose b. Hanina, explains the suffering of the righteous similarly to R. Johanan or R. Jonathan. His parable illustrates the case by the dealing of the flax-grower with flax.[32] R. Eleazar b. Pedath brings home to his audience this doctrine by the parable of the farmer who had two cows, one is lean, the other strong. 'On which will he put the burden? Surely, on the stronger!'[33] These sayings reflect the sufferings of the righteous, which we detected in another group of sayings by the same

[30] Gen. r. 92. 1: כל יסורים שהם באים על האדם ומבטלין אותו מד'ת יסורים של תוכחות הם, אבל יסורים שהן באים על האדם ואין מבטלין אותו מד'ת של אהבה הן; cf. Prov. 3 12; v. also Tanh. B. i. 201 f.

[31] Gen. r. 92. 1: אין לך בן אדם בלא יסורים אשריו לאדם שיסורים באים עליו מן התורה. Tanh. B. i. 202 has a different saying of this teacher on our subject, which reads: אשרי אדם שיסורין באין עליו, והקב'ה אמר להם די, שיש להם סוף; Gen. r. 92. 1 gives it in the name of R. Hoshaja. R Alexander's statement is in the Tanhuma, attributed to R. Bisna. It reads: אין אדם בעולם שאינו בא לידי יסורין, הוי אדם חושש בעינו ואינו יכול לישון, בשינו אינו יכול לישון ואלא ער כל הלילה, ואדם ער כל הלילה ויגע בתורה זה ער, וזה ער, הוי אשרי אנוש שיסוריו בתורה.

[32] v. Gen. r. 32. 3 and parall. given above.

[33] Gen. r. 32. 3.

Rabbis also. Both go back to moral and religious conditions, the details of which are still to be discovered.[34] The very teacher of whom we are speaking here may help us to find the key to these events. In two sayings are preserved the causes of suffering as advanced by Eleazar b. Pedath: 'Chastisement is caused by giving alms or bread to a man who has no knowledge.'[35] Further, he sees the root of this evil in scoffing: 'Upon him, who mocks, suffering will come'.[36] R. Ammi held a similar opinion: 'There is no death without sin and no suffering without guilt.'[37] R. Assi taught also that Job had deserved much more suffering than he actually suffered, because God said to Satan: 'Thou hast provoked Me against him, in order to destroy him without cause!'[38] R. Isaac, to whom we owe a direct historical reference to the general suffering of the people in this period, which throws light on the fact that nearly all the teachers deal with this problem,[39] developed a new theory that the sufferings in this world will be recompensed by the wonders and rewards in the world to come. An idea which is somewhat akin with that of R. Akiba and R. Samuel b. Nahmani.[40] Some of the more or less serious losses and visitations vicariously exempt or free men from more serious suffering. A man, who committed sin is guilty of death by Heaven. He loses his fowl, breaks his bottle, wounds his little finger. All these are substitutes for greater losses, illness or death.[41] Considering the general poverty of the Jews in this time, it is no surprise that the loss of a chicken or a bottle should be regarded as a matter

[34] v. Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits*, 98.

[35] b. Sanh. 92 A: כל הנותן פתו למי שאין בו דעה יסורין באין עליו.

[36] b. AZ. 18 B: כל המתלוצץ יסורין באין עליו.

[37] Lev. r. 27. 1; Eccles. r. 5. 4; pal. Sabbath 55 A: אין מיתה בלא חטא ואין יסורין בלא עון; cf. Ez. 18. 4 and Ps. 89. 33.

[38] Source unknown, in מעין גנים of Samuel b. Nimin, ed. Buber 8.

[39] Cant. r. 2. 5; Pes. B. 101 B: וביותר שאני חולים מן המלכות אדם מתאוה לשמוע.

[40] Pes. B. 157 A.

[41] Pes. B. 165 B: Eccles. r. 7. 23; pal. Sota 17 A.

of great grief. R. Helbo connects likewise the problem of suffering with the doctrine of reward and punishment. Differing from the teachings we heard above, and with more originality than 'There is none who does not suffer', he asserts that even the greatest sufferer occasionally experiences God's benefits. These blessings are due to the sufferings they endure, which do by no means diminish man's reward. This teaching is illustrated by a parable in which an orphan boy figures, who was brought up by a farmer, who provided him with food, drink, and clothes, and apprenticed him. The boy thought that he was being provided for on account of the work that he did. The provisions made for him are his wages. The farmer, however, says: 'You get your food and drink and clothes for occasional works, by filling a barrel of water, or hewing wood; your real wages are kept with me.' Israel is the orphan. Whatever Israel enjoys in this world is due to the sufferings; their real reward is kept for the next world.[42] R. Helbo repeats also the doctrine of R. Akiba that the sufferings are destined to free Israel from their sins in this world, so that they shall be worthy to inherit the world to come.[43] R. Aha regarded sufferings, Torah, sacrifices, and prayers as the four things which God offered to the generation of the Flood; yet they were reluctant to receive them. 'They said to God: "Depart from us (סור = יסורין), the knowledge of Thy ways, we desire not (= תורה); what is the Almighty that we shall serve Him (עבודה = קרבנות), and what profit shall we have if we pray unto Him (תפלה = נפגע)?"'[44] The real meaning of this homily points rather to the conditions of the teacher's own age than to that of the people of the Flood. He tries to show that suffering, study of the Torah, worship of God and prayer, have atoning power before God.

[42] Deut. r. 3. 4.

[43] Pes. B. 151 B, r.: ר׳ ברכיה ר׳ חלבו בש״ר שמעון בן יוסינא בש״ר בש״ר שמואל; Lev. r. 29: בשם ר׳ שמעון בן יוחאי; r. perhaps מאיר בר נחמן; v. also Pes. B. 152 B, in the name of R. Jeremiah. The teaching reads: מיסרך אני ביסורין בעולם הזה, בשביל לנקותך מעונותיך לעולם הבא.

[44] Exod. r. 30. 10.

The sufferings were divided, this teacher taught, in three different parts. One part was apportioned to the Fathers, the second to the generation of the persecution, and the third part is preserved for King Messiah.[45] By the דורו של שמד here the contemporary persecutions and sufferings were meant, not those of the Hadrianic time. As to the sufferings of the Fathers, we have a remarkable passage by R. Judah b. Simon. Abraham asked for old age (in order that father and son could be distinguished by the signs of old age), Isaac prayed for suffering, Jacob for illness (that man should not depart from this world suddenly). We are here concerned about Isaac, who prays: 'Lord of the Worlds, if a man should die without suffering the measure of judgement is spanned against him (מדת הדין מתוחה כנגדו). When, however, Thou bringest upon him suffering, the measure of judgement is not spanned against him!' God said: 'Thou didst ask for a good thing, I will start with thee!'[46] The same teacher sees in Israel's suffering in this world a preparation for the next world.[47] A similar thought is reported by R. Judan[48] and by R. Hanina b.

[45] M. Sam. ch. 19, ed. B. 101, R. Huna in his name: לשלשה חלקים נתחלקו הייסורין, אחד לדורות, ולאבות, ואחד לדורו של שמד ואחד למלך המשיח. Precisely the same saying is quoted M. Ps. 2. 9, ed. B. 28, by R. Huna, in the name of R. Idi; read perhaps ר' אחא instead of ר' אידי. The reading אחת נטלו אבות העולם וכל הדורות is to be preferred to the reading לדורות ולאבות; v. also R. Levi in the name of R. Idi; M. Ps. 16. 4, ed. B. 121.

[46] Gen. r. 65. 4. The passage shows that the Rabbis discussed the question: Why was Isaac suffering from blindness? This teacher, R. Judah b. Simon, gave one answer. The same is given by R. Levi, who says: יצחק חידש יסורין. R. Hanina b. Papa suggested, 'In order that Jacob should be enabled to receive the blessings'. There seem to have been earlier disputes on that point. R. Eleazar b. Azarja, e.g., advances the view that Isaac became blind in order that he should be spared to mix with people, who spoke evil of him, the father of Esau. Anonymous sayings connect Isaac's infirmity with the sacrifice on Moriah.

[47] Lev. r. 33. 2: אמר הקב"ה איסרם אני ביסורין בעוה"ז אבל לע"ל לא אוסיף עוד עבור לו.

[48] Gen. r. 92. 1: ומה הללו שן (עבדו) שאינן בכל גופו שלאדם אלא אחד

Isaac.[49] R. Hanin of Sepphoris, combining Gen. 12. 10 with Ps. 94. 12, derives from the example shown by Abraham that the sufferer must not murmur against God, or complain of his trouble, but bear it patiently like Abraham.[50] A similar admonition is contained in a sermon of R. Tahlifa of Caesarea. 'In case of trouble or suffering coming on thee, receive them with joy, and do not despair at seeing the wicked Esau being happy and prosperous!'[51] The great power of atonement vested in suffering is vividly described in a sermon of R. Dosithai of בירי. He depicts David as a Samaritan merchant. David says before God: 'Lord of the whole world! Who can understand (avoid) errors?'[52] God says: 'I forgive them.' 'Cleanse me from my secret sins!' God: 'I forgive them.' 'Keep thy servant back from presumptuous sins!' God: 'I forgive them.' 'Let them not have dominion over me', i.e. the teachers should not speak of my sins in their lectures and sermons. God: 'I forgive them.' 'I shall be innocent from my great transgression', i.e. either it shall not be written at all, or forgive me that sin I committed! God says: 'It is impossible!' David: 'Am I lost altogether?' (כל הכי נטרד ההוא גברא 'Is there no remedy for me?'). God says: 'Take upon thyself sufferings!'[53] Finally, we notice that some of the

מאיברין אמרה תורה לחפשי ישלחנו מי שיסורים באים עליו שהן בכל גופו של אדם עא כו"כ; v. also the story of R. Hama with the blind man, who used the term שאת בן חורין לעוה"ב.

[49] M. Ps. 90. 16, ed. Buber 393: כל מי שקדמוהו יסורין בעולם הזה ישלו חלק לעולם הבא; 'he is like Abraham, who is called ירא אלהים'. The idea is expressed in Ps. 90. 11: וכיראתך עברתך 'and according to the fear of Thee, so is Thy chastisement', e.g. of those who fear thee.

[50] Gen. r. 40. 2; cf. 92. 2: מה כתיב באברהם ואברכה ואגדלה שמך כיון שיצא קפץ עליו רעבון ולא קרא תגר ולא הקפיד אלא וירד אברם וכו' ויהו רעב בארץ.

[51] Deut. r. 1. 17: אם באו עליך יסורין קבל אותן בחיבה אל תתחר במצליח דרכו זה עשו.

[52] Cf. Ps. 19. 13.

[53] b. Sanh. 107 A. David's sins and deeds were commented on very unfavourably by some of the teachers and the people. Many teachers of the third century preserved valuable material on this point, like R. Joshua

teachers saw in Job and his suffering, in his loss of wealth and children, in his illness and condemnation of his right, a true picture of Israel's fate and history. As Job ultimately was rewarded and justified, so will Israel at the end of the days regain the right place in the world.[54]

(7) *Goodness.*

How is God's justice to be reconciled with a beneficent God? How can God's goodness prevail in face of all the evils of this world? If God is compassionate, long-suffering, forgiving, then all the doors stand open to sin and licentiousness! Since the teachers of Judaism opposed dualistic theories just as much as they combated polytheistic influence, these queries and doubts, answers and sayings reflect an earnest grappling with these questions. If there is one teaching which can be regarded as unquestioned and unopposed, it is the doctrine of God's love, which extends to Jews and Gentiles, good and bad, human beings and the animal world alike. Writers on Christian theology are wont to point out this as a result of Jesus's teaching. They boast, we can see with what right, that the spread of the Christian doctrine of love changed the face of the world and the hearts of mankind. This is just as great a fallacy as the generally held view that Rabbinic theology teaches a particular, and not a universalistic, God. One preacher concludes his sermon; 'Just as God's love extends to human beings (אדם), so His mercy is upon the cattle and birds'.[1] Another preacher calls attention to the fact that God has mercy even at the time of punishment with the wicked and their cattle.[2] 'He who loves his fellow crea-

b. Levi; v. M. Ps. 5 c, R. Isaac, Gen. r. 41, R. Samuel b. Ami, Pes. B. 10 B, Pes. R. 147 B, R. Samuel b. Nahman, pal. Ber. 2. 1, b. Sabb. 30 A. The heretics of the Church liked to display their animosity and malice when referring to David; cf. Clem. *Hom.* iii. 21 and 25; *Diodor of Tarsus*, ed. Harnack, 113 and 129; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, 421.

[54] v. Lam. r. 3. 1; M. Ps. 102. 8; Pes. B. 26 B.

[1] Deut. r. 6. 1. [2] Exod. r. 12. 3.

tures (על הבריות) will be loved by God.'[3] God is, according to R. Judah b. Simon, תוכו רצוף אהבה (Cant. 3. 10), the midst of it being paved with love.[4] 'The Lord is good to all, and His tender mercies are over all His works' (Ps. 145. 9), repeated daily by Jews, took deep roots in the minds and souls of all believers in God and worshippers in the synagogues. God's loving providence extends to all creatures, to all comers of the world (באי העולם). He is the saviour of mankind, more so of Israel.[5] Even in battle, in fighting the Egyptians, He deals mercifully with His creatures.[6] 'He feeds and sustains all.'[7] This act of loving-kindness is shown not only to those who are just and righteous, but even to the wicked. They are supplied according to their needs and provided sufficiently.[8] God's love and providence know no limits between just and wicked; moreover, He provides even for the beasts of the field, big and small, sustains the plants and herbs in His goodness and grace.[9] R. Gamaliel II stated: 'God feeds the world, from the mighty unicorn to the smallest vermin.'[10] Rab repeats this by saying: 'God is occupied for a third of the day in feeding the mightiest and smallest.'[11] In another connexion R. Gamaliel II, or R. Zadok, according to a variant, expresses this view of God's providence, in which all creatures share equally, in these words: 'God, who created the world, causes wind to blow, sun to shine, rain and dew to descend, plants to grow, and decks a ready table to all!'[12] It is noteworthy that Tineius Rufus, in his dialogue with R. Akiba, uses the very words: 'Why does your God cause the wind to blow? the rain to descend? the herbs to grow on Sabbath?'[13] A Min (unbeliever) taunted the Elders in Rome with the same question, using the very

[3] b. Shabb. 151 B. [4] Pes. B. 12 B; Cant. 3. 10; Num. r. 12.
[5] Mekh. 37 A; M. R. S. b. J. 62. [6] Ib. 38 A; M. R. S. b. J. 62.
[7] Ib. 38 A.
[8] Ib. 59 A; R. Zadok; v. also b. Kid. 32 B; Midr. Prov. 12 A; R. Gamaliel II, Sifre Deut., § 38.
[9] Mekh. 59 A. [10] v. further in the chapter on the existence of God
[11] b. A. Z. 3 B. [12] v. note no. 8 above.
[13] Gen. r. 11. 6.

same words.[14] Both the Roman general and the nameless Min must have belonged to the Stoics, who believed in the providence of the gods. God is the sustainer of all; of the whole world. Yet their philosophy objected to God's resting and working on Sabbath in the same breath. To the same school must have belonged the interlocutor of R. Johanan b. Zakkai, according to some texts, of R. Joshua b. Hananja, according to a second version, and of R. Joshua b. Korha, to a third reading. Rain is provided by God for all, without distinction of creed and race.[15] In the time of great distress, before and after the Bar-Kokhba war, there were Jews who doubted whether God can supply even His people with food.

R. Jannai repeats the words of R. Gamaliel: 'A man buys a pound of meat. How much trouble and pain does it cause him till he sees it cooked. I, God, cause wind to blow, clouds to lift, rain and dew to descend, plants to grow and ripen, a table is ready before everyone, all the creatures get all they need, each person according to his requirements.' The same words are varied by R. Phinehas b. Hama.[16] R. Simon b. Pazzi compared God in the manner of the Stoics with the soul, and saw in the soul the sustainer of the body, in God the provider of food and sustenance.[17] Joseph, in saying grace at the table of his Egyptian master, thanked God, who supplies food for all.[18] An anonymous Haggadist says: 'God supplies with food all His creatures without expecting or receiving any reward; are we not bound to thank Him?'[19] Another dwells on the contrast between God and men. The latter gives alms to a poor beggar once, twice, a month, or a year, but God gives food to man all the days he is alive.[20]

[14] Exod. r. 30. 6; Pes. r. ch. 23; Tanh. תשא, 33.

[15] Deut. r. 7; Gen. r. 13; M. Ps. B. 479.

[16] Eccles. r. 1. 4.

[17] v. above, p. 196, for the Stoics, v. Diogenes of Babylon, 82, ed. Gomperz, and Seneca, ep. 65. 24; Philo, *de opif. mundi*, 23; Bergmann, *Judaica*, 136.

[18] v. further on.

[19] M. Ps. ed. Buber, p. 482.

[20] Jelamdenu, ed. Grünhut, *Genesis*, 23 A.

This belief in God's providence was so firm and unshakable in the creed of the scribes that a man who worried about his food for the next day, was regarded as lacking in faith. Their trust in God's goodness and mercy knew no limit.[21] The immovable trust in God, taught and shown by Prophets and Psalmists, was not weakened and did not fade away in the times of the Rabbis, in the so-called age of the 'Spät-Judentum'. 'Do you know whom you shall trust? Him, who created Heaven and earth. He, who trusts Him, his reward will never cease!'[22] R. Simon b. Pazzi says in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi: 'He, who trusts in God is worthy to become like Him, but he who puts his trust in the idols is bound to become like them.'[23] This scribe sees in man's unchangeable and immovable trust in God the highest form of the imitation of God.

A second aspect of God's goodness is to be found in a teaching expounded by R. Johanan b. Zakkai, which was later on very often developed and enlarged upon. We mean the saying: הקב'ה חס על כבודן של בריות 'God pays due regard to the honour of the creatures.'[24] R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, a very rigorous judge of human character, said, according to Abba Hanin: 'God pays due regard even to the honour of those who transgress His will, how much more that He does so to the honour of those who do His will!'[25] That we have to supply here the words על כבודן של עוברי רצונו is apparent from a third teaching of this type. 'God has pity on the wicked', says an anonymous teacher

[21] v. the passages, Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits*, 175. 11; cf. Epictetus, *Diss.* i, 9. 19: 'If ye get satisfaction to-day, and are despairing of to-morrow, what shall we eat to-morrow? wretched people! if you got to-day, surely you will be provided for to-morrow. If you do not get it, well, then commit suicide!' What a world of difference between the Stoic philosopher and the Jewish teacher! v. Bergmann, *loc. cit.*

[22] M. Ps. 434 f. [23] Deut. r. 5. 9.

[24] Mekh. 88 A; Tos. B. R. 7. 10: בא וראה כמה חס המקום על כבוד הבריות; b. B. K. 79 B: כמה גדול כבוד הבריות; v. also Sifre Deut., § 192; Tanh. f. 11 A.

[25] Sifre Num., § 11: חס המקום על עוברי רצונו; v. pal. Sotah 2. 2; b. Sotah 14 A: אם ככה חסה תורה עך עוברי רצונו; Num. r. 9. 13.

of the Tannaitic period, 'how much more on the honour of the righteous'.[26] R. Joshua b. Levi goes even a step further! 'God did not reveal the name of the tree Adam ate from, neither to Adam, nor will He ever reveal it! See what is written! "And if a woman approach unto any beast, &c." (Lev. 20. 16). If a human being sinned, what is the crime of the beast? Why should one kill the beast? In order that people should not point at the beast, saying, "Through it X got stoned!" If God is so particular about the honour of His creatures, how much more is He considering His own honour?'[27] On the other hand, R. Huna in the name of R. Idi taught that God pays more attention to the honour of the Zaddik (righteous) than he cares for his own honour.[28] 'He shows honour to those who fear Him. God, certainly, guards the honour of all His creatures, even of those who sinned against Him, and became honourless by their misdeeds.' Those who fear Him, are put a grade higher. For God Himself honours them. How? 'Solomon sits on God's throne (1 Chron. 29. 23), Elijah rides on God's horse (cf. Nahum 1. 3), Moses uses God's sceptre (Exod. 4. 2), the Messiah will wear God's crowns (Ps. 21. 4), Israel, God's garment (Ps. 29. 1), Moses, God's name!' All these things are unthinkable with human kings. They would never tolerate that others should be called by the titles *Καῖσαρ*, Augustus, or *Βασιλεύς*, others should wear their uniform, crowns, or use their sceptre, horse, or throne. God makes those who fear Him share these honours. They are so near Him that they become like God![29]

We notice thirdly that the scribes have been contending against the opinion whether God could satisfy His crea-

[26] T. K. 84 A.

[27] Gen. r. 15. 8, ed. Th. 141–2, based on the Mishna Sanh. 7. 4.

[28] Pes. B. 15 A; Tanh. f. 36 A: חס המקום על כבודו של צדיק יותר מכבודו.

[29] Tanh. f. 71 B; Tanh., Buber ii. 22 f.; Exod. r. 8. 1; M. Ps. 21. 2, ed. Buber 177, by R. Simon, with additions and variants; Num. r. 14. 3, by R. Abin.

tures. R. Benjamin b. Levi, whom we know as a zealous opponent of heretic ideas, deals with the problem whether God can do justice to all parties. We read that Ahasuerus did 'according to the wish of each man'. God said to him: 'I cannot do according to the request of each of my creatures' (אני איני יוצא מידי בריותי), and thou dost seek to fulfil the wish of each individual. Supposing two men were to ask for the hand of one woman, can both of them marry her? No, either one or the other! Further, if two ships wait in the harbour, one for the north wind and the other for the south wind, can one fulfil both? No! Either it is a south or a north wind. In future there will stand before thee in judgement two men, a Jew and a wicked person. Canst thou do justice; satisfy both of them? No, one will be exalted and the other crucified! R. Benjamin adds to this the thought which may be turned against those who believe that God is not almighty, 'that this happens in this world; in the world to come these things, like the service of two winds at the same time, will be possible'.[30] R. Abbahu held to the contrary that God can fulfil the desires of each of His creatures. It was revealed and known to Him, 'who said and the world was created' (גלוי וידוע לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם) that the nations of the world will not receive the Torah. 'Why did he attempt to offer it to them (lit. מפני מה יצא ידיהן Why did He desire them to acknowledge it?)?' 'For this is the measure with Him. He does not punish His creatures lest He gave them a chance to do the right thing, for He does not force His creatures' (שאין הקב"ה בא בטרוניא על בריותיו).[31]

God's love to His creatures, whether good or bad, Gentiles or Jews, is as we see, one of the most emphatic and characteristic doctrines of Rabbinic theology. We are taught by Dr. W. Newton[32] that 'various true views of

[30] Esther r., ch. 2, end; Lev. r. 9. 5; Num. r. 13. 3; Cant. r. 4. 31; v. also Yalkut Makh. 145. 26.

[31] Pes. B. 200 A; Tanh. f. 283 B.

[32] *The Christian Doctrine of God*, ed. 1909, 84.

God have been entertained by men, but that *God is love* has never been proclaimed as truth and wrought out into a message of grace and help. This is the Christian speciality; and a religion that has such a truth to offer could not set in anywhere but at the front. No wonder that the new song is a song of the love of God.' We dare to challenge this statement, not only on historical grounds. Jews, and as a matter of fact, Christians themselves, have seen very little of its beneficial influence, and deplored on very many occasions the application of this love. If Christianity had acknowledged God's love as the highest principle of religion and believed in God as the God of love, if that had been the real conception of religion up to this day, the history of the world ought to appear quite different from that picture which lives in the mind of all those who know it! There are in the Gospels glowing passages of God's love; but many more, spoken or written with greater force and power, which show a very uncompromising attitude towards all those who do not agree, either in thoughts or in deeds, with the teachings of Christianity. Rabbinic teachings extend God's love and grace, goodness and mercy, to sinners. 'God is the Father of all beings, of the whole world. "A wise son makes a glad father" (Prov. 10. 1). The father is God, who is the Father of the whole world!'[33] God provides food even to those who provoke Him (e.g. the daughters of Lot), how much more to those who do His will.[34] The same sentence is repeated in the teaching derived from the story of Israel's rebellion in the wilderness, when they doubted God's power to give them bread and meat.[35] He does not desire the downfall and destruction of the wicked.[36] *R. Samuel b. Ami* teaches 'that God desired to lodge with His creatures since the first day of the creation',[37] or, according to another version, he desired to make partner-

[33] Midr. Prov. 13 A on Prov. 10. 1.
[34] Mekh. 36 A.
[35] Ib., pp. 48 A, B.
[36] v. above, note 31.
[37] Gen. r. ch. 3; Num. r. 13; Pes. r. 7. 27 B.

ship with the creatures. The classical verse of the Psalmist (104. 9) expressing God's love to all is explained by three teachers of the third century. R. Joshua b. Levi says: 'God is good to all, to all who are His works.' R. Samuel b. Nahmani expounds: 'God is good to all, and His mercy extends over all, for His nature is to be merciful.' R. Levi sees in it a higher idea. 'God is good to all, and the greatest good is that His creatures learn of Him to be merciful to each other.'[38] Again the *imitatio Dei!* R. Hijja puts this teaching somewhat differently. 'A human being who has a friend, as long as the latter is rich, cleaves to him, loves him; when he gets poor, he ridicules him. God is different. When a man becomes poor, God lifts him up and helps him.' Yet this teacher limits God's support only to the righteous, and does not extend it to the wicked. His view opposed a perhaps older view, which agrees with that of the Mekhilta, that 'God supports and erects even the wicked!'[39] To each living creature is granted the desire of its heart. R. Abba adds: 'Even if it was not uttered, only thought of in the heart.'[40] Owing to this nature of God, He was called הטוב '*the Good*'. For rain and good tidings the blessing in the time of the Mishna was: ברוך הטוב והמטיב 'Blessed be He, the Good One, and who does good.'[41] 'The world was created out of goodness.'[42] The morning prayer expresses this with ובטובו מחדש תמיד and המחדש בטובו. Further we come across the name רחמנא 'the Merciful', which is closely associated with our teaching. R. Akiba taught: כל מה דעביד רחמנא לטב עביד 'What God does is done for some good purpose, though it seems to us sometimes harsh, cruel, or incomprehensible'. R. Huna, Rab, R. Meir, who are connected with the saying, bear out that we have in it an adage known to and uttered by many people.[43] The same teacher, R. Akiba, emphasizes that

[38] Gen. r. 33. 3, ed. Th. 304.

[39] Tanh. B., i. 151–2; v. also Ag. Ber. ch. 48.

[40] Exod. r. 24. 3.

[41] M. Ber. 9. 2; pal. Ber. 13 D; pal. Taan. 69 A; b. Taan. 31 A; Gen. r. 13, ed. Th. 123–4, 613.

[42] M. Tadshe, 29.

[43] b. Ber. 60 B.

'all creatures are loved by God, all of them created in the image of God.'[44] Israelites took a somewhat higher place, for they are called God's children. They received the Torah. The love of God, however, knows no distinction, all are created in the image of God. When R. Akiba preached in גנזק של מדי on the subject of the people of the Flood, his words did not make the slightest impression on the audience. As soon, however, as he turned to the history of Job, all of them cried. He applied to them the verse in Job 24. 20, 'They have shown no love and mercy to their fellow creatures, so has God turned his love away from them'.[45] The generation of the Flood found no sympathy even in their tragic fate, for they were merciless. 'He who shows no love to his fellow-men can expect no love from Heaven.'[46] R. Aha said: 'When drought comes, and the creatures are merciful to each other, God is also filled with mercy toward them.'[47] R. Tanhuma preached at such an occasion of general distress: 'My sons! Fill yourselves with mercy toward each other, and God will be filled with mercy to you!'[48] The teachers of Judaism never wearied of describing or speaking of the great mercy shown by God to mankind. The attributes and ways of God are full of mercy and lovingkindness. The character and the deeds of man are crooked. Those of God are full of mercy, as it is said: 'The Lord is merciful and gracious' (Ps. 103. 8).[49] Another teacher taught: 'We know that the mercy of God will last for ever. We have not consumed it. His mercy is still with us. The nations say: "Come and let us cut them off" (Ps. 83. 5). "His compassions do not fail us". Moreover, "Thou dost renew us every morning, and raisest us". By this we know that Thy faithfulness is great to all Thy creatures' (לכל באי עולם).[50] 'A

[44] Aboth iii. 15; Mekh. 94 a. [45] Gen. r. 33. 7.
[46] B. K. 6 c; Sifre Deut., § 97 and 117. [47] Gen. r. 33. 3.
[48] Ib. 33. 3. [49] Exod. r. 2. 1.
[50] M. Ps., ed. Prague, ch. 67, ed. Buber, p. 314, with variants; M. Lam., ed. Buber, p. 132.

worldly king sends his legions against a city which rebelled against him. They kill all the inhabitants of the city, whether faithful or rebellious; God, however, saves the life of the righteous,[51] for His mercy is upon Him. The mercy of men extends more to the male than to the female. God's compassions are alike to male and female; moreover, they include all creatures, even the cattle.'[52] This aspect of Rabbinic theology is most concisely put by a Tannaitic teacher, who says: 'I am the Lord your God, I am the Lord, "who spake and the world was", I am the judge, I am full of mercy, I am the judge to punish, and faithful to pay reward!'[53] These ideas were so widespread and well-known that we find besides the name רחמנא,[54] the name בעל הרחמים for God. R. Levi says: 'The Lord of Mercy does not touch the souls first', i.e. does not punish in the first instance with death.[55] God says to Moses: 'Thou art a human being, therefore thou couldst not hear them; I, however, am the Lord, compassionate, the Lord of mercy; I have mercy on them!'[56]

The conceptions of God's providence and love have been subjected to criticisms in many quarters, and from many points of view. The slightest doubt as to God's mercy and love was considered heretical. An old Mishna enumerates three instances, for which the reader in the public service is removed from the reading desk. One of these instances is, if he read: 'Thy mercy reaches the bird's nest, but for me there is no mercy'.[57] The proper text of this Mishna was a matter of contention as far back as the third century. There were obviously two distinct readings. The first

[51] M. Tanh. i. נח 10, Ag. Ber. 9–10.

[52] Sifre Num., § 133; Yalk. i. 773.

[53] T. K. 74 A.

[54] v. the saying: רחמנא לבא בעי God wants the heart; v. b. Sanh. 106 B, where we read הקב"ה; further רחמנא ליצלן, b. Yeb. 63 A, B. K. 65 B, Sabb. 84 B, Taan. 9, B. Kid. 81 A, Ket. 111 A, j. Sanh. 8. 1, Gittin 17 A, M. Ps. 436.

[55] Lev. r. 17. 4; Pes. r. ch. 17, 88 B; Ruth r. 2.

[56] Eccles. r. 7. 7; Exod. r. 6. 2.

[57] M. Ber. v. 33 B; M. Meg. iii. 25 A.

read: עד קן צ׳ 'Thy mercy reaches up to the bird's nest'. The second had: על קן 'Upon the bird's nest. God's love, which is infinite, is limited.' [58] It is still doubtful of what the heresy consists in this saying. It may be that the heretics thought of the bird's nest as the smallest of the small things to which providence may extend, but for smaller things, like worms, insects, &c., it does not care. Rab, the Babylonian teacher, taught: 'God provides for all creatures, from the mightiest beast to the smallest worm.' [59] There is another comment on this Mishna. Such heretics are meant, according to it, who hold that only those commandments are obligatory which are as clear as that of Deut. 22. 6–7, because they are natural; other commandments, which do not appeal to common sense, their reason or intention being obscure, need not be observed.[60] The words of the text seem to favour the first interpretation. There must have been Jews who, under Epicurean influence, doubted or limited God's mercy.

Others tried to prove the idea that God is *cruel*. The Haggadists repeat the words of the critics, who say of God 'that is His custom, He destroys the generations in a cruel way (כך היא אומנתו לחייב את הבריות במדת אכזריות). He destroyed the generation of Enosh, that of the tower-building. He cannot leave off His ways!' God replies: 'Abraham, come and see for yourself! All the generations I have destroyed shall pass before thee; and thou shalt see that they were not punished by me according to the measure of their wickedness. If, however, thou shouldst think I meted out their punishment too severely, very well, teach me, and I will do according to what thou dost say, for it is written, "That which I see not, teach thou me; if I have done iniquity, I will do so no

[58] R. Phinehas b. Hama in the name of R. Simon b. Pazzi, j. Ber. 5. 3; Meg. 14. 10 and R. Jose in the name of the same teacher; v. also b. Ber. 38 B, b. Meg. 25 A, where R. Jose b. Abun and R. Jose b. Zabdi give a different Palestinian tradition.

[59] v. above, p. 197, and b. Sabb. 107 B; v. Ass. Mosis 12. 4.

[60] v Aptowitzer, *MGWJ.* 57. 16 f.

more!"' (Job 34. 32).[61] We must presume that only stringent reasons moved the Haggadist to invent this strange dialogue between God and Abraham. Indeed, an earlier teacher faced the same objection to the doctrine of God's mercy. He assumes that before Abraham appeared, God punished the world rather cruelly.[62] The latter Haggadist wanted to weaken that impression. 'The sins men commit changed the merciful and gracious God into a cruel God.'[63] This reproach resounds in another passage also: 'God says to Moses, "Enough! By thy prayers thou bringest me and thyself into ill-fame. They will say, 'Moses must have been a great sinner, so that God did not grant his request', and further: 'God is cruel! See how much Moses prayed, and he did not listen to him!'"'[64] The teachers of the third century dealt with the same question. They derived hence a new aspect of the relation between God and man. R. Johanan said: 'Hence we learn that no creature can claim anything of his Creator. Even Moses, the teacher of all the prophets, does not dare to approach Him, only in the way of supplication.'[65]

Another difficulty of the same type was the commandment: 'Remember what Amalek did unto thee' (Deut. 25. 17), which implies cruelty, and contradicts the words: 'Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite' (ib. 23. 8). 'Come and see', says an Haggadist, 'not like the nature of God is that of man. A man never rids himself of some wrong done to him by his fellow-man. God is different. Israel was enslaved in Egypt (Exod. 1. 13), and when they acquired their freedom, then came Amalek, who was of the seed of Esau, and did so many wrongs to Israel, God, notwithstanding all these, enjoins them, "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite!"'.[66]

Thirdly, we notice that the teaching of God's mercy gave

[61] Tanh. B. i. 91; Ag. Ber. ch. 22, ed. B. 45.
[62] Sifre Deut., § 311.
[63] Tanh., Yalk., Hos. 527.
[64] Mekh., Yalk., Deut. 820.
[65] Deut. r. 2. 1.
[66] Pes. B. 22 B.

rise to the notion that God forgives all sins. 'God is gracious and merciful, full of lovingkindness and forgiveness; then all the lines between righteousness and wickedness, sin and virtue, are wiped off.' One of the greatest mercies of God is the Jewish aspect of forgiveness of sin. Whilst some thought the Merciful cruel, others taught that He is too compassionate; He never punishes. No deed is so bad that it should find no pardon with Him. This doctrine must have led to great and regrettable abuses. R. Hanina taught therefore in a very frequently reported and seriously pronounced saying: 'He who says, "God is too pitying", his life should be cut off!' [67] It may be that R. Hanina turned against Bar Kappara, who taught that God forgives all sins except immorality. [68] Judah b. Nahmani, the famous Meturgeman, also raised his voice against people of this caste. He rebuked them by pointing to the words of Micah (7. 5), '"Trust ye not in a friend; put ye not confidence in a friend!" If the evil inclination tells thee: "Sin, God will forgive thee!" do not trust such a friend (cf. Gen. 8. 21), and put not your confidence in a leader, i.e. God, who is compassionate.' [69]

(8) *Purity and Holiness.*

The real meaning of purity in the Haggada is applied to a life free from sexual errors and moral stains. Whatever the words טהור 'pure', and טהרה 'purity', might have conveyed to the primitive mind, in the ages of the Tannaim and Amoraim it was conceived in this sense. R. Jonathan says of the daughters of Israel, that they are קדושות וטהורות 'holy and pure'.[1] A Midrash fragment[2] contains an exposi-

[67] pal. Taan. 48 D; pal. Shek. 48 D; pal. Beza 62 B, Gen. r. 6. 4; b. B. K. 50 A; Esther r. chaps. 7 and 8; Tanh. f. 126 B; M. Ps., ed. Buber, 93; R. Judah.

[68] Tanh. 26; v. also M. Ps. 24 D, R. Abba b. Kahana's saying, Lam. r. 1. 2, and others.

[69] Cf. Jer. 3. 4; b. Hag. 16 A.

[1] Sifre Deut., § 214; v. also Büchler, *Types of Jewish Palest. Piety*, 53 f.

[2] v. Wertheimer, בתי מדרשות, i. 41.

tion of Lev. 18. 3, saying: בניי אם מבקשין אתם לירש את הארץ הזאת שמרו עצמכם מן העריות ומכל דבר של קלקלה והיו טהורין וקדושים ואתם יושבין לבטח. R. Hijja bar Abba says: כל אשה שמייתחמת מן בעלה בקדושה ובטהרה לא קפח הקב׳ה שכרה אלא נותן לה בן צדיק כמשה ואהרן, מנא לן משמואל הנביא דכת׳ בו וכו׳ אשר שאלתי מעמו למה שנזרע בקדושה ובטהרה.[3] This conception contradicts a very wide-spread feeling among primitive and advanced peoples, that all birth is intrinsically impure.[4] Jewish religion in our period was free from this view. R. Meir said that the sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu died because they remained unmarried.[5] King Hezekiah was visited with a severe illness because he did not want to marry.[6] One Haggadist compares the fruit of the womb (children) to the fruits of the ground. God says: 'Just as the latter are produced without sin or iniquity, so bringing forth offspring is without sin or iniquity.'[7] How is this difference between Jewish religious feeling and the generally conceived opinion of the Greek-Roman world[8] to be explained? Surely by the doctrine of God's purity. In Jewish thought there is no room for any sexual idea in connexion with God. It is, as a matter of fact, *the* only religious system where no goddess appears or figures in any way. The influence of this omission cannot be highly enough calculated in the development of Jewish religion. The aberrations of antique religions as well as of Christianity are to a great extent due to this fact. God, however, is purity itself. This is admirably expressed by R. Abdimi of Haifa, who teaches that God says to man: 'Behold, I am pure, my abode is pure, my ministers are pure, the soul I give thee is pure: if thou shouldst return her as I gave her to thee, unstained and undefiled, well; if

[3] Quoted in *Halakoth Gedoloth*, ed. Hildesheimer, p. 38.

[4] v. Farnell, *The Attributes of God*, 189 f.

[5] Num. r.; v. Yalkut Sikili, MS. Bodl., 3 A, B. [6] v. Ber. 11 A.

[7] Eleh Debarim rabba; Yalkut Deut. 848.

[8] v. Abt, *Die Apologie des Apulejus*, 111 f.; Fehrle, *Kultische Keuschheit in Altertum*, 31; Harnack, *Origenes*, i. 60. Many traces of these doctrines can be found in our sources as well. They imply, however, only physical, and not moral impurity, as will be shown later.

not, I burn her before thee!'[9] The purity of God and the human soul are often compared, just as the providence of God for the world and the care of the soul for the human body.[10] God shuns even the mention of an impure word, therefore it is said אשר איננה טהורה in Gen. 7. 8, instead of טמאה, according to R. Joshua b. Levi,[11] 'God is called pure and He will purify Israel'.[12] R. Akiba says that 'Israel has no one else to purify him but his Father in Heaven'.[13] R. Akiba meant purification from all kinds of sin and transgression. Sin defiles man. We find this idea expressed in an ancient Boraita:

ת"ר ולא תטמאו בהם וכו'
אדם מטמא עצמו מעט, מטמאין אותו הרבה,
מלמטה מטמאין אותו מלמעלה,
בעולם הזה מטמאין אותו לעולם הבא,
ת"ר והתקדשתם והייתם קדושים,
אדם מקדש עצמו מעט, מקדשין אותו הרבה,
מלמטה מקדשין אותו מלמעלה,
בעולם הזה מקדשין אותו לעולם הבא.

'He, who defiles himself a little, will be defiled a good deal. Here, beneath, will be defiled from above. In this world, will become defiled in the future world.' The same happens to those, who sanctify themselves a little, beneath and in this world, they will be hallowed in the world to come, from above, and a great deal (b. Joma 39 A). The threefold defilements and sanctifications respectively describe the sins against ourselves, our fellow-men, and God, and the virtues of pious deeds performed in this world, towards our fellow-men and ourselves. The sins increase self-defilement from above, and in the future world. Virtues and merits have the opposite result.

[9] Eccles. r. 12. 7; Lev. r. 18.
[10] b. Ber.; Midr. Ps.; Lev. r. 18.
[11] Pes. B. 31 A; Gen. r. 32; M. Ps. chaps. 1 and 12; b. Pes. 3 A.
[12] Pes. B. 71 B.; Exod. r. 15. 5.
[13] M. Yoma end.

Impurity stands for sin generally, and sanctification for a life according to the Law.

In spite of these conceptions we find that some of the Rabbis held the view of man's physical impurity. R. Jose the Galilean teaches that those who intend to enter the camp of the Shekhina have to separate (פרישה) from their ordinary habitation. Moses did so. The High Priest followed this example by removing seven days before the Day of Atonement to the precincts of the Temple. R. Nathan thought that Moses waited for forty days before he ascended the Mount, in order to rid himself of all chances of physical impurity. The washings before meals, prayers, entering the sanctuary, after certain natural functions are closely connected with this idea of purity. This is not the place to describe what role they played in ritual life among Jews. However great may have been the fear of and belief in evil spirits in certain circles and different periods, this cannot be denied, that the primary motive of these purifications of the body was the endeavour to attain physical purity, which is most befitting the vehicle of the soul, whose purity is akin to the purity of God. Body and soul together aspire to become like God's purity.

The teaching of God's purity gave rise to many questions. There seem to have been two different views. God's omnipresence presupposes that even in the defilement, impurity, and sin of idolatry and immorality, God's purity does not suffer. God is with His people in Egypt. Babylon, Media, and Persia. Yet, Moses left the city in order to deliver his prayer, or in order to hold communion with God. 'Why? Because the city was full of idols and abominations.'[14] Owing to this idea, the synagogues in the diaspora were built near the river, or on the fields, apart from human habitation. A similar conception is to be found with the Greeks. The Shekhina is not revealed outside the Holy Land, probably for this very reason (Mekh. 2 B). A sage of the third century, R. Abbahu, was

[14] Mekh. 2 B.

questioned by a Min: 'Your God is a priest; when He buried Moses, He became defiled; how did He purify Himself? surely not by water!'[15] The teacher proved God's purification by fire, which is greater than that of water. Whether the questioner was a Christian, which is quite probable, for R. Abbahu lived in the place of the Church-father Origen, or a Gnostic, is not certain. If he were a Christian, the answer might mean an attack against the doctrine of baptism with water. In reality the accepted thought may have been that of R. Johanan b. Zakkai, who taught: 'Neither is the dead defiling, nor the water purifying.'[16] Here Jewish religion reached a height which was rarely surpassed by theological speculation. Yet this lofty idea could not achieve great popularity. A teacher derives from Ps. 51. 5 that sin and transgression defile man like the dead body.[17] Sin and impurity are identical. The influence of sin on the Shekhina is expressed in the words of R. Isaac: 'He who commits sins in secret is as if he had pushed the feet of the Shekhina.'[18] Many sins are in such a degree impure that God's presence, the Shekhina, is being removed from earth. God and the sinner cannot live in the same world. God has removed His Shekhina from the place. The teachers must have felt the contradiction between God's omnipresence and the temporary disappearance of the Shekhina from a place.

R. Phinehas b. Jair also connected these two attributes. Purity and holiness are correlatives. This correlation is seen in the Biblical writings, and is frequent in our sources. The former apply this attribute to men and angels—to the whole community and nation. God's holiness must be man's highest guiding ideal. What it means was conveyed to the reader of the Scriptures, when he read such passages as: 'Ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy: for I am holy' (Lev. 11. 45),

[15] B. Sanh. 39 A.
[16] Pes. B. 40 B, and Parall.
[17] M. Ps. ch. 51, ed. B. 281.
[18] b. Kid. 31 A; Hag. 16 A.

or, 'Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy!' (ib. 19. 2), or, 'I will be hallowed among the children of Israel; I am the Lord which hallow you' (ib. 22. 32), or, 'Be holy unto your God' (Num. 15. 40), or, 'And ye shall be holy men unto me' (Exod. 22. 30), or, 'And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation' (ib. 19. 6)? Surely the deep thought that by abstinence from evil, by following God's commandments, by imitating His ways, by attaining virtue and morality man can acquire holiness was familiar with the readers of the Bible, and the audience of the Rabbinic preachers. Even in the Tannaitic period certain men were still called 'holy ones'; R. Meir is introduced to the people of Sepphoris by R. Jose b. Halafta with the words: a great man, a holy man, a chaste man! (אדם גדול אדם קדוש אדם צנוע, v. pal. Ber. 5 B, ii. 7; Gen. r. 100. 7; Weiss, *Dor Dor we Dorshaw*, ii. 148; Bacher, AT. ii. 5).[19] R. Simon ben Lakish is surprised at R. Meir's teaching, and exclaims: פה קדוש יאמר זה, a holy mouth should say such a thing? (b. Sanh. 23 A). R. Phinehas ben Jair states: ישראל קדושים הן (b. Hullin 7 B).[20] R. Ishmael says: כשאתם קדושים הרי אתם שלי, Mekh. 98 A. similarly, the great editor of the Mishna, who was styled רבינו הקדוש. Great men were addressed in this way. With the adoption of the name 'the Holy one' for God, a great change is to be observed. For this very reason we are taught that with the death of Rabbi 'Holiness ceased among men'. Men, even the greatest and most pious, we hear from Haggadic teachers in this age, cannot and must not be called 'holy' any more. God alone is

[19] קדוש and גדול together also in Num. r. 4, 22. אמרו רבותינו שני דברים היו קדושים וגדולים וכסבורין בני אדם שהן קשים, also with צנוע; ibid. כל בית אבי היו צנועים וקדושים.

[20] v. to this Num. r. 9. 5: ומנין שישראל נקראו קדושים בעת ששומרים עצמן מן הניאוף ומן הזמה לכן כתיב והתקדשתם וכו׳ מכאן בזמן שהם קדושים הוא להם לאלוה: Special attention may be drawn to the saying of R Judah b. Simon, Tanh. ii. 33, מהו נרפים? א׳ל קדושים אתם.

holy, *errare est humanum*; men whilst alive, are liable to err and stumble. No wonder that the teachers turn away from the idea of man's holiness, and preach on the subject of God's holiness.

'God's holiness is perfect.'[21] The teaching preserved in the name of R. Abba, שהוא קדוש בכל מיני קדושות, and explained by R. Aha b. Hanina, deal with this subject. 'God is holy in His speech (cf. Ps. 60. 8), in His walk (ib. 77. 14), in His appearance (ib. 63. 3), in His praise (Exod. 15. 11), and the revelation of His strength (Isa. 52. 10),[22] Very instructive is an anonymous homily, which throws welcome light on our doctrine.[23] God says to Israel: '*Before I created my world* the angels praised me, and sanctified me with your name by saying, "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from eternity to eternity".'[24] When Adam was created, they said: 'Lord of the World, is this he in whose name we praise Thee?' God says: 'No, he is a thief!' (cf. Gen. 3. 17). Then came Noah, and they said: 'Is this he?' God: 'No, he is a drunkard!' (cf. ib. 9. 21). Afterwards appeared Abraham, and God said again: 'No, he is a stranger (proselyte)'; 'Isaac?' and God said, 'He loves mine enemies' (cf. ib. 25. 28); 'Jacob?' Then God said, 'Yes, he is the man, who is called Israel' (cf. ib. 35. 10): and after him his offspring. Then God sanctified them after His name (cf. Isa. 49. 3). God said: 'Since ye were sanctified after My name before the world was created, be hallowed as I am holy'. The homily concludes, after quoting a parable of a king, who married a queen, with the words: 'If ye are worthy, ye are called the "congregation of the holy ones", if not, "the wicked community"' (cf. Num. 14. 26). This homily deserves a more detailed treatment from various points of view. First of all, the idea that there were ministering angels *before* the creation of the world. Teachers of the third century, under the heavy

[21] v. Josh. 24. 19: כי אלהים קדושים הוא.

[22] v. pal. Ber. 12 D; Tanh. iii. B. 73 f.; M. Ps. 27; R. Isaac b. Hama.

[23] Tanh. iii. 72 f.

[24] 1 Chron. 16. 36.

pressure of Gnostic propaganda, allied with Christian attacks against our doctrine, taught that God created the angels on the second or the fifth day.[25] These days were, as we know, kept as days of special importance.[26] Yet in the Tannaitic Haggada this teaching of the creation of the angels was not known at all. R. Jose the Galilean taught that 974 years before the creation the angels existed already.[27] An old Jewish exorcism has the same doctrine, that the angels were created about a thousand years before the Universe. That enables us to date the homily before the change introduced by R. Johanan and R. Hanina was effected. Secondly, attention may be paid to the rather harsh treatment of the Fathers from Adam up to Isaac. All the Haggadas which contain a more or less condemning word about the Fathers of old, could not have sought simply to exhibit human weakness and to belittle the greatness of the heroes of yore. Thirdly, the holiness of Israel is especially pointed out. The latter idea occurs in other homilies and sayings. 'Who are His holy ones? Israel,' cf. Deut. 7. 6, Jer. 2. 3.[28] Jews, the children of Jacob, are the *true Israel*, but not the *new nation*, the offspring of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as the Church-Fathers taught.[29] Owing to this fact Jews are never called in our sources יהודים, as Greeks or Romans, Syriacs or Arabs called them, but Israel. R. Menahem b.

[25] v. now Marmorstein, 'Beiträge zur Religionsgesch. und Volkskunde' in *Jahrbuch für jüd. Volkskunde*, ii. 377, note 5; Gen. r. ch. 1, ed. Th. 5, ch. 3, p. 24; Tanh. i. B. 1 and 12; Ex., pp. 15 and 22; M. Ps. chaps. 24, 86, 104; Pirke R. E. ch. 4.

[26] v. Graetz, *MGWJ.* 4, 1855, 191; Fabricius, *Hypomnesticum Josephi*, ch. 145; Codex Pseudep., v. 5; Halakhoth Gedoloth j. Taan. 64 c; Luke 18. 12; Soferim 21. 3; v. Geiger's *Wiss. Zeitsch.* iv. 221; Hamanhig, 19 B; Gen. r. 76. 3; Tanh. B. וישלח 16; Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iii. 318; Achelis, *Das Christentum*, 117.

[27] Aboth R. N. ch. 31, ed. Schechter, 47 A; Midr. Ps. 4. 3; Tanh. לך לך 11; Seder El. r., ed. Friedmann, 9. 61, 130; Hag. 14 A; M. Ps. 90. 13; 105. 3.

[28] M. Ps. B. 540.

[29] v. on this question, my *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, i. 9–18.

Simai was called the son of the 'holy ones'.[30] This teacher belonged to the circle of Rabbi, who was also called 'holy,'[31] and who addressed the Exilarch Hananja לקדושת חנניה 'His Holiness'.[32] To this age belong the sayings: כל הגודר עצמו מן הערוה נקרא קדוש[33] and כל המקבל עליו דברי חכמים נקרא קדוש,[34] in spite of the fact that the latter is taught in the name of Abajji, and the former by R. Judah b. Pazzi. Both, as the language and context prove, are older sayings. R. Joshua b. Levi, who was much older than R. Judah b. Pazzi, comments on the former saying. Abajji, as can be seen from the parallels in the Palestinian Talmud,[35] used here older material. But apart from this internal evidence we have other proofs that the ideas and conceptions about the holiness of man, must have experienced great changes. This alteration of attitude is discerned in a saying of R. Simon b. Lakish,[36] who says: 'Ye shall be holy; you might think like God Himself? No, it is written, "for I am holy"; my Holiness is of a higher degree than yours'. This change of outlook is even more apparent in the saying: 'No pious man is called holy whilst he is alive', cf. Eccles. 7. 20. 'Even the Fathers of the world are not called "holy" before their death.' This teaching must be of the third century because teachers of the fourth century dwell and comment upon it[37]

What was the reason for this change? We know the reaction in Christianity which took place in the Church after the middle of the third century.[38] The crudest superstition arose from the lowest parts of the population

[30] b. A. Z. 50 A; b. Pes. 104 A; v. Pal. A. Z., ch. 3.

[31] b. Shabb. 118 B; Pal. A. Z. 42 c.

[32] pal. Sanh. 19 A.

[33] Lev. r. 24. 6.

[34] b. Jeb. 20 A.

[35] ii. 4.

[36] Lev. r. 24. 9: והדין קדושים תהיו יכול כמוני ת"ל כי קדוש אני קדושתי למעלה מקדושתכם.

[37] M. Ps. B. 120; R. Phinehas; Gen. r. 1. 9; b. Hama, and R. Aha b. Pappa. The latter name is not quite settled; some read R. Hama b. Pappa, others R. Hijja b. Pappa; one text reads erroneously R. Hama b. Hanina.

[38] v. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*[3], 1894, ii. 6 F.

and covered with its darkness all the purity and morality of ancient Christianity, which it brought from the Father's mansion. The earliest Christians and Apologists would have hidden their faces in shame at beholding the union of paganism and Christianity. One of these dangers, which changed Christian religion, was the worship of saints, under which lurked the demons of idolatry. Jewish teachers saw the same peril hovering over their religion. The false beliefs, superstitions, saint-worship, crudeness, and perversity which arose from their surroundings and threatened the whole edifice of holiness. What Harnack sees in the Church of the third century can be observed by the study of Rabbinic writings of the third and fourth centuries. A change was therefore necessary. Man is not holy, even the Fathers are not holy. 'Only One is Holy: God'. This induced the leading Scribes to discard the old names and put in their place the name of הקדוש ברוך הוא.

The holiness of God is in Judaism the essence of religion. Holiness is not the *tabu* of primitive and more advanced religions. It is the expression of what the religious Jew feels when discharging his religious duties, observing his Sabbath and Festivals. All his deeds and words are emanating from the Divine Holiness. How far this and other attributes influenced the religion of the Rabbis, their changes and development, will be shown in the next chapters dealing with the anthropomorphism and imitation of God. If religion has a purpose in life and the world, it must bring God near to man, and man must become like unto God.

PRINTED IN ENGLAND AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY JOHN JOHNSON
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY